

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—JANUARY, 1905—No. 117.

CATHARINE II. AND THE HOLY SEE (1772-1796).

AMONG the crowned heads of the eighteenth century none was more inimical to the Holy See than Catharine II. of Russia. Other sovereigns, Catholic and Protestant, held up to the lips of the Papacy the bitter chalice of persecution and humiliation; it was reserved for the autocrat of all the Russias to compel the Popes to drink it to the dregs. Not even the hydra-headed Revolution of the doctrinaires and Jacobins of France did so much damage to Catholic interests as this woman by her dealings with the Polish nation, the Holy See, and the Roman Catholic populations that she annexed during the last twenty years of her reign. Elsewhere in Europe the views of Gallicanism and Febronianism have been to a considerable extent counteracted and weakened; the ruins of the Reign of Terror have been partially cleared away. But the work of Catharine of Russia was done with thoroughness—not only were the immediate results of enormous importance, but all hope of restoration was shut out by her iron Byzantinism, her unparalleled cunning, and the new secularism of her policy and her measures. She robbed the Roman Catholic Church of more millions of souls than ever were in Ireland in the days of its greatest population, and she built up between them and Rome a Chinese Wall of exclusion that stands to-day, a sign and earnest of

the actual commercial and political intentions of the vast State, whose second founder she truly was. What was this woman like?

I.

Catharine was the daughter of a little German Prince, Christian of Anhalt-Zerbst. She had been brought up in ignorance and was married at 16 to the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, who became Emperor of Russia (Peter III.) at the death of his aunt, the debauchee-Empress Elizabeth (1762), youngest daughter of Peter the Great¹. Her married life was unhappy enough, for the Emperor was an ugly, consumptive and bibulous creature, unpopular in Russia, and to her every way unsympathetic. One day (1762) she usurped his throne and caused him to be murdered. Not long after she had the pretender, Iwan VI. (son of Empress Anna, 1730-1740), barbarously put to death, after he had spent most of his sad, young life in prison. Thus opened the career of a woman who lived to affect profoundly her own State and her subjects, and to transmit to her successors an anti-Catholic religious policy that has never been abandoned.²

The lives of other Russian Empresses of the eighteenth century had been such as to make Elizabeth of England appear like a model of correctness, and to justify the work of John Knox, "Against the Monstrous Regiment of Woman" (1557). But Catharine II. surpassed all limits of decency and has left to posterity the example of the grossest personal immorality in the highest station a woman could occupy. Her paramours were State officials, treated after the fashion of the mistresses of Louis XIV., with special provision and residence—the famous "Appartement." They were often the real governors of Russia. The Orloffs and the Potemkins, and all the minor and later lovers of this great ex-Lutheran dame, were like Viceroys in the State, and often affected in public an Oriental splendor. It is said that she squandered on these men fully eighty millions of dollars—to Potemkin she allowed not only an unhampered authority, but one-third of the revenues of all Southern Russia. Her Prime Ministers, like Panine and Bezborodko, were dissolute gamblers and indolent libertines.³

¹ Ch. Du Bouzet, "La Jeunesse de Catherine II.," Paris, 1860. Rambaud, "Catharine II. dans sa famille," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Feb., 1874.

² Voltaire has this to say of the death of Peter III.: "On parle d'une colique violente qui a delivré Pierre Ulric du petit désagrément d'avoir perdu un empire de deux mille lieues. . . . J'avoue que je crains d'avoir le cœur assez corrompu pour n'être pas aussi scandalisé de cette scène qu'un bon chrétien devrait l'être. Il peut resulter un très grand bien de ce petit mal . . . et d'ailleurs quand un ivrogne meurt de la colique, cela nous apprend à être sobres." Nourisson, Voltaire et le Voltairanisme, p. 347.

³ De Vêrac, the French ambassador, wrote: "Quand on est temoin de la

Much has been written of her efforts to renovate Russia—there was certainly a vast field for her labors. We do not need to deny the improvement of roads and communication, the attempts to colonize and improve Southern Russia and to create cities and centres of commerce, her interest in French letters and the fine arts as represented by the French scholars, architects, painters and sculptors she employed. St. Petersburg is really a creation of French genius. She imitated as far as possible the French Academy and Madame de Maintenon's school of St. Cyr. In a huge educational establishment built at Moscow she educated many thousands of young Russians, somewhat on the plan of Alexander when he educated the thirty thousand young Persians in his brand-new Greek schools, that they might forget to love their fatherland and adore the conqueror. It is true that she succeeded, superficially, in changing an Asiatic into an European power.

On the other hand, she permitted the great majority of her subjects to live in abject misery through fear of her own powerful nobility and wealthy subjects. Her famous "Instruction pour la confection d'un nouveau code," all filled with plagiarisms from the humanitarian writings of Montesquieu and Beccaria, was held to be a huge joke and a comedy by foreign observers at her court. The great meeting of 652 deputies at Moscow, representing every Russian estate and interest, except the bulk of the unhappy serfs, recalls the late meeting of the Zemstvos at St. Petersburg. It ended only in riveting more tightly the chains of the popular slavery. What that was like may be learned from the story of Daria Soltykof and her serfs (Lavissee-Rambaud, VII., 440). The poor man in her vast domains had security, for she almost never interfered with the rights of the proprietors, and herself increased the number of unprotected serfs by donating many thousands of crown-serfs to her discarded lovers, who thenceforth treated them as private property.

The population of Russia remained ignorant and abandoned, while she corresponded with Voltaire and Diderot⁴ and wrote "comédies de mœurs" or indulged her violent passions.⁵ The stupid

vie dissipée à laquelle ils se livrent l'étonnement n'est pas que les affaires se fassent mal: l'étonnement est qu'elles se fassent, Lavissee-Rambaud, "Histoire Générale" (Paris, 1896), VII., 437.

⁴ Pingaud, *Les Français en Russie*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 15, 1900. For the correspondence of Catharine with Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, Falconet and others, cf. Rambaud, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, 1877.

⁵ A Russian writer, M. Bilbassof, began not long ago a complete history of Catharine II. The first volume (in Russian) appeared in 1890, whereupon it was forbidden in Russia—so scandalous is yet at St. Petersburg the true history of "Sainte Catherine." It was then translated into German, and, with the second volume, was published at Berlin in 1892. Cf.

ignorance of her people was made evident when they slaughtered the Archbishop of Moscow because he interfered with their superstitious conduct during the awful pest that decimated that city in the summer of 1771. Her reign was characterized by many savage "jacqueries" of the misguided multitudes who followed after every impostor like Pougatchef, in the vain hope that Peter III. had come to life again and would relieve their miseries. Her political reforms were superficial and worthless, for she could not affect the true source of the universal robbery and corruption—the characters of the men to whom all Russian interests, civil, military and naval, were confided. Her own household was an open pestilential source of immorality in all its most glaring and scandalous forms. Her boasted civilization was only a thin veneer that revealed easily the fierce untutored barbarism which it was meant to hide and not transform. Under the hypocritical pretext of reforming her own church she confiscated the lands and revenues of the monastic corporations, only to waste this wealth on her lovers, on unmeaning and unsuitable attempts at the improvement of Russian life among those already comfortable. She had forever in her mouth the words of tolerance, humanity, equality, religious liberty, and was nevertheless the most intolerant and oppressive of all rulers. Such a woman could have existed only in the Russia of the eighteenth century, and only in a land where all ecclesiastical spirit and liberty had long since been seared as with a hot iron and the mouths of the clergy made dumb with fright or stopped with secular gifts and advantages. It was to this woman and her officials, civil and ecclesiastic, that the helpless Roman Catholics of Poland were turned over between 1772 and 1796. What she did to them and what obstacles she put in the way of the reunion of Christendom, and the spiritual elevation of the Russian people themselves, is a chapter of history that needs to be pondered carefully if we would understand the relations between Russia and the Holy See in the century that has closed.⁶

M. K. Waliszewski, "Le Roman d'une Impératrice, Catherine II. de Russie, d'après ses mémoires, sa correspondance et les documents inédits des archives d'Etat," Paris, 1893, 80. This work contains quite curious details concerning her private and public life. Cf. Nourrisson, *op. cit.* p. 351. The same author has also written another work on the court and surroundings of Catharine, "Autour d'un Trône," Paris, 1894.

⁶ Many papers and documents of the reign of Catharine, in their original text, as well as much of her correspondence, may be found in the volumes of the very extensive Russian "Collection de la Société Impériale;" other materials are in the great (Russian) work known as "Old and New Russia." The published legislation of Catharine is found in the "Collection complète des Lois Russes" (40 vols.). The treaties of her reign are in the second volume of Martens' "Recueil des traités, conventions," etc. There exist a great many curious and valuable memoirs of her reign, both in Russian and

II.

Three points are worthy of note in the dealings of Catharine with Catholic Poland—her promises to Europe in general, her promises to Poland and the measure of execution she gave to her promises and her treaties. Before the Europe of her time she poses as the protectress of her oppressed co-religionists and of all the dissidents in Poland. She laments publicly their unhappy condition, and poses as a magnanimous Princess defending in the name of outraged conscience and broken treaties the natural liberty and equality of the human race. The “*bonheur du genre humain*” is so dear to her that she is ready to take up arms to extend it to all men. As to the integrity of Poland, sorely threatened by the constant interference of Russia, she asseverates most solemnly (June 9, 1764) that she has no designs upon the territory of Poland; rather will she return all that belonged to that kingdom by the treaty of Moscow (1686), and thenceforth defend and protect its just and legitimate possessions. When she wrote these words she had already signed a treaty with Frederick the Great, on March 3 (April 11), 1764, in which both agreed to maintain the frightful internal anarchy of Poland and to prevent any consolidation of the royal authority. After the election of her puppet candidate and former lover, Stanislaus Poniatowski (August 7, 1764), she began anew her intrigues against the peace and welfare of this sorely troubled nation.

It is well to remember that at this time Poland was substantially a Catholic land. Of its eighteen million souls (*Les-coeur*), only four millions were dissident (Russian and Protestant) and two millions were Jews and Musselmans. The constitution recognized the Catholic religion as the State religion. The Protestants and the Orthodox had full liberty of worship, though they were not allowed for evident reasons to exercise public functions. Catharine covered her first attacks with the approval and coöperation of the Protestant courts of England, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, which chivalrously demanded for the Polish dissidents rights and privileges that they did not allow to their own Roman Catholic subjects—all this in the name of “the happiness of the human race” and of the humanitarian principles of the encyclopedists. By misrepresentations on the part of her ecclesiastical agents, by intrigues and acts of violence on the part of her

in Western languages, *e. g.*, the memoirs of De Ségur (Paris, 1824-1859), and Algarotti, “*Lettres sur la Russie*,” Paris, 1769. Formal histories of her reign have been written by Tooke (in English), Leclercq, Soumarakof, Lefort, Jauffret (Paris, 1860), Solovief (vols. XXV.-XXIX. of his *Russian History*, Moscow, 1875-1879) and Brückner, in the *Oncken* collection, Berlin, 1883.

civil representatives, by lying promises and assurances of her own "coeur de mère," and with the unjust complicity of the northern Protestant courts, she attempted to force from the Polish Diet and Crown what she called "the sacred rights of the dissidents." This meant in the circumstances of the time a hopeless continuation and increase of the political anarchy that had been prevalent in Poland for centuries. That it was not an honest zeal for religious equality on the part of Catharine or the northern courts is evident from the fact that their Roman Catholic subjects continued to groan under all the disabilities of the past. We have only to recall the legal conditions of the great majority of the Irish people in the time of Catharine, both as to Church and State. As a matter of fact, says Lescoeur (pp. 1-2), the kingdom of Poland was at this period "the only nation in which the dissidents (from the national church) had full and complete liberty of belief and worship." Certainly the Protestant kingdoms of Europe were at this time in open contradiction with their own constitutional principles and administrative praxis when they undertook to impose on Poland what was practically a new constitution, while they forbade her at the same time to remedy the mortal defects of the older one.⁷

The year 1764 is a fatal one in the annals of Poland. It marks the election of her last King under circumstances of extraordinary humiliation, the secret treaty between Frederick and Catharine that consummated the downfall of the kingdom, and the beginning of a series of internal dissensions that arose partly from the mutual jealousies of the quasi-royal magnates of the kingdom, partly from an inveterate habit of external interference in Polish politics, and partly from the absence of cohesion in the different estates of the kingdom. Patriotic and religious and brave the Poles certainly were, but far-seeing and self-controlled and consciously concordant for their country's welfare they as certainly were not. The wretched

⁷ For the Catholic view of the pretext of the dissidents, cf. "Jus dissidentium in regno Poloniæ seu scrutinium juris in re ad rem theologicam juridicam," Varsaviæ, 1736; Lengenich, "Jus publicum regni Poloniæ," Gedani, 1735; Zaluski, "Conspectus nov. coll. leg. eccl. Polon. Varsaviæ, 1774. The dissident contentions are in "Jura et Libertates dissidentium in regno Poloniæ," Berlin, 1707. The works of Janssen and Klopp give a Catholic treatment of the subject. Cf. Luedtke in Wetzer and Welte, "Kirchenlexicon," III., 1857-1861, and for the Protestant view Reimann, "Der Kampf Roms gegen die religiöse Freiheit Polens," 1573-1574, in Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1864, XIII., 379, "a treatise," says Cardinal Hergenroether (III., 128), "to be read with much caution and reserve." There are numberless accounts of the fall of the Polish state, all colored by the views and principles of each writer; cf. Rulhière, "Histoire de l'anarchie de Pologne," Paris, 1807; Raumer, "Polens Untergang," Leipzig, 1832; Johannes, Janssens, "Zur Genesis der ersten Theilung Polens," Freiburg, 1865, and "Russland und Polen vor 100 Jahren." Cf. also Onno Klopp, "Friedrich II.," Schaffhausen,

disunion and cross-purposes of their Diets during this decade, notably those of Radom (1767) and of Warsaw in the same year, enabled Russia to interfere effectively with the last stages of their national independence, to bring her troops permanently into Polish territory, and to put cruel enmities between the national government and the righteous sentiments of the people. The Confederation of Bar (in Podolia), though quite in keeping with similar military uprisings in Poland from time immemorial, and bravely sustained by most of the great magnates, dwindled constantly in importance during the five years of its existence (1768-1772). However, it begat the Russo-Turkish war of the same period, out of which the Muscovite issued with much military and naval glory, owing to the lamentable corruption of Turkish officialdom, but the full fruits of which were on all sides denied to Russia, as was the case a century later when the treaty of San Stefano was so amended at the Conference of Berlin as to divide unequally the spoils of war; this time, however, at the expense of Moslem Turkey. Now, however, it was Christian and Catholic Poland who must indemnify Russia for the losses caused by the powerful jealousy of Austria, backed up by the secret encouragement of her nominal ally, Frederick.

The latter had long since proposed to Catharine, and now urged strongly the partition of Poland; and as Austria was nibbling at the territory of the "Republic," the occasion seemed finally favorable.⁸ The most enormous political crime of modern times was consummated in the spring of 1772 between the chancelleries of Berlin, St. Petersburg and Vienna. Some timidity characterized the action of the latter court, which Frédéric rudely but truly characterized when he saw that Marie Thérèse "wept continually, but took her share as regularly." The excuse given to astonished Europe was unhappily, in fact, only too true: "the general confusion of the affairs of the Republic by reason of the discords of its magnates and the perverse temper of its citizens." Of the population thus unjustly torn from the Polish nation Austria received 2,600,000 souls, Prussia something less than a million and Russia about 1,600,000. The territory was divided, not without

1807; Raumer, "Polens Untergang," Leipzig, 1832; Johannes Janssens, "Zur Causes de la Chute de Pologne," *Revue Historique*, March, 1891, and De Broglie, "Le Secret du Roi," Paris, 1878.

⁸ To the mendacious assertions of Prussia and Russia, that they were only emphasizing ancient rights, long dormant in their archives, the Polish Diet justly replied that all such pretended claims had long since been wiped out by treaties, cessions and peaces. Weber, "Weltgeschichte," Leipzig, 1889, p. 329. If in a time of peace such titles of an unoffending state were not valid, what state of Europe, least of all Prussia and Russia, could lay claim to the inviolability of its territory?

some snarling, according to the political interests of each of the coparceners.⁹ Some twelve minor treaties were necessary to force this robbery on Poland, whose bleeding trunk was still left standing, and to finally delimitate the acquired territories. By the year 1776 the first act of the dread drama was accomplished.

Its political consequences were very far-reaching.¹⁰ Though Prussia obtained the smaller portion, it was, nevertheless, a very precious addition, for she thereby wiped out the long-standing Polish wedge between the kingdom of Prussia and the lands of Brandenburg and Pomerania, to which only a few years before she had added the greater part of Silesia that Austria had been compelled to cede. Greatest of all gains, perhaps, she made her Baltic coast continuous forever. In her half of White Russia Catharine came far short of the protectorate that she had originally hoped to exercise over Poland, to the exclusion of all other powers. Austria had risked nothing, but came off with the richer and more desirable part of the splendid booty. Russia acquired a homogeneous territory and population that had always been Russian in tongue and blood, while the strictly Polish territory confiscated fell entirely to Prussia and Austria. Prussia acquired a considerable German population and Austria some ancient Russian territory (Red Russia, Volyhnia, Podolia). Poland itself was now a State of only ten millions, whereas it had a population of some eighteen millions about the middle of the eighteenth century. Her condition was also more hopeless than ever, for the complicity of the three dividing nations made them solidary against any future reclamations of the sublime victim.¹¹

⁹ "Dans la mise à exécution les Russes procédèrent brutalement, les Prussiens avec résolution et cynisme, les Autrichiens avec une méthode impitoyable et des airs de pudeur revoltée. Bientôt leurs complices durent les avertir qu'ils prenaient trop. Eh quoi! Lemberg, les salines de Wieliczka, cette unique source de revenu pour le roi de Pologne! Frédéric disait à Swieten: "Permettez moi de vous le dire: vous avez bon appétit." Lavisserambaud, "Histoire Générale," vol. VII. (1896), p. 509.

¹⁰ "Prussia and Austria alike, by joining to wipe out the central state of the whole region, have given themselves a mighty neighbor. Russia has wholly cast aside her character as a mere inland power, intermediate between Europe and Asia. She has won her way, after so many ages, to her old position, and much more. She has a Baltic and an Euxine seaboard. Her recovery of her old lands on the Duna and the Dnieper, her conquest of new lands on the Niemen, have brought her into the heart of Europe. And she has opened the path which was to lead her into the heart of Asia and to establish her in the intermediate mountain land between the Euxine and the Caspian." Freeman, "Historical Geography of Europe" (ed. Bury), 1903, p. 521.

¹¹ "Cela réunira les trois religions grecque, catholique et calviniste," wrote Frederick (April 9, 1777), "car nous communions d'un même corps eucharistique qui est la Pologne, et si ce n'est par pour le bien de nos âmes

We may add with a writer (Rimbaud) not suspected of partiality towards Rome or Poland, that this crime against one of the oldest continental States, and which had so often drawn the sword to protect the West against the hordes of barbarians, troubled profoundly the conscience of Europe. The pagan law of might was now openly set up in the place of the ancient Christian international law. "Hereby was created a revolution in public law (*un droit révolutionnaire*) that authorized a priori all the conquests of the Convention, the Directory and Napoleon."

The only authoritative voice that was lifted for Poland was that of the Pope. He saw only too clearly that the suppression of the political liberty of Poland was equivalent to the ruin of Catholicism in that nation. Clement XIII. wrote (April 10, 1767) to King Stanislaus that the efforts of the dissidents could only end in the total ruin of their fatherland and that they could hope to advance their private interests only through treason to the Republic. A few days later (April 29) he wrote to the King of France as follows:

Our paternal love for you, and our desire for your true and lasting glory, suggest that we point out the occasions through which the eldest son of the Church may manifest his piety towards his Holy Mother. Your Majesty is aware that all the peoples among whom the light of the Gospel shines form but one body, the Catholic Church, of which Christ is the head. . . . Hence, if one of the members be suffering, all ought to suffer with it. Now, this is the situation of your brothers in Jesus Christ, the Catholics of Poland. The dissidents in that kingdom have left nothing undone to ruin the faith, to overthrow the most sacred laws, and to change the form of government on which depends the fate of the Catholic religion. Who can deny that to free this nation from such dangers is an object supremely worthy of your Majesty?

The France of 1767 was unequal to such "*Gesta Dei*," and no doubt the Pope was well aware of it. It was indeed in no interest of France that Poland should be divided or weakened, yet, as a matter of fact, it was the wrong-headed and inopportune intervention of Choiseul that actually brought about the partition of Poland. To his agents at Constantinople is largely owing the declaration of war by Turkey against Russia that, as we have seen, made evident the weakness of the Ottoman power, the last bulwark of Polish independence, and left the Republic at the mercy of Frederick and Catharine. Two days later (April 31) Clement XIII. wrote to the King of Spain:

In view of the terrible revolution of which Poland is a victim, it is our apostolic duty to exhibit compassion towards this orthodox people, and to implore for them the aid of the Catholic princes. . . . We appeal to the religious sentiments of your Majesty, and we implore you in the Lord to use all the counsel, good offices and zealous efforts that your wisdom may suggest, in order to succor this illustrious and innocent nation.

To the Emperor, Joseph II., he wrote about the same time, and *ce sera sûrement un grand objet pour le bien de nos états.*" His cynical blasphemy is in keeping with the magnitude of the injustice and violence of which he was the first instigator.

in similar terms of earnest prayer and exhortation. He tells him that he is the head of the Holy Roman Empire; that his is the first place in the Christian Republic, and that as such he is the protector and champion of the Catholic Church. He describes with vigor the revolting iniquity of the pretensions of the dissidents as put forth and sustained by Catharine. They are not content, he says, to abide by the laws of Poland, which treat them with the greatest humanity, but they have become so bold as to demand entirely new laws for the whole kingdom, which are detrimental to the Catholics. They insist on extorting from an independent Catholic government advantages which the non-Catholic Princes of Europe everywhere deny to their Catholic subjects. The Pope could do no more; or, rather, he could invoke the aid of the Almighty. This he did by the canonization (1767) of Saint John Canty, an illustrious theologian and professor of Cracow (1397-1471). He caused a strophe to be inserted in the office of the saint that will forever bear witness to the affection of the Holy See for the unhappy Poland:

O qui negasti nemini
Opem roganti patrium
Regnum tuere; postulant
Cives poloni et exteri.

Clement XIV., during whose reign the partition of Poland was accomplished, was no less faithful in his endeavors to obtain from the Catholic courts some measure of help and encouragement for the Confederates of Bar. And when he could do no more for the independence of the Polish nation, he remained keenly alive to the religious liberties of the new subjects of Russia. Shortly before his death he protested through his Nuncio at Warsaw against all acts detrimental to the Catholic faith. Marie Thérèse wrote to the Nuncio Visconti that no moderation or justice were to be expected from Catharine, who approved fully the cruel violence done by her agents to the churches and the persons of the Uniat Greeks. Clement XIV. wrote (September 7, 1776) to his Nuncios at Vienna, Madrid and Paris:

The recent accounts of the disasters of the Church in Poland and Russia are not calculated to confirm in the mind of the Holy Father his long-cherished hope that a vigorous intervention of the powers would secure for the Catholics of Poland and Russia that religious freedom which he implores heaven constantly to preserve for them. Let the powers at least lessen his fear of going before the tribunal of God as guilty of any omission in so grave a matter. . . . If they were unable to prevent the pre-concerted and violent dismemberment of the nation, let them at least protest in favor of the rights and prerogatives of religion.

Compare these admirable efforts with the cynical letters of Voltaire to Catharine apropos of the partition of Poland and the noble efforts of the Confederates of Bar to restore their country's inde-

pendence and greatness. The Polish confederates are declared by him to be a contagious pest; he sneers contemptuously at their pious and chivalrous manifestoes, and abuses the brave handful of Frenchmen who went to their aid. Catharine is a radiant figure in his humanitarian pantheon, and the greatest saint that the North has yet produced (December 3, 1771).¹²

In the treaty which the King and Diet of Poland were compelled to sign September 18, 1773, the eighth article reads as follows:

In the provinces ceded by this treaty the Roman Catholics shall continue to enjoy all their civil rights; with regard to their religion, the *status quo* shall be constantly observed, *i. e.*, they shall have freedom of worship and discipline, together with all their churches and ecclesiastical properties, in the condition that they were found when they passed under the domination of Her Imperial Majesty, in September, 1772. Her successors shall not enforce their sovereign rights to the prejudice of the *status quo* of the Roman Catholic religion in the above-mentioned territories.¹³

In the same sense Catharine wrote (December 31, 1780) to Pius VI. (Theiner, II., 106):

From the beginning of our reign to the present day we have decreed and maintained within our vast empire the freedom of every one to worship unhindered the living God, without any oppression of any religion whatsoever. On the contrary, our sceptre is the support of every religion and is favorable to its followers as long as they deserve favor and perform the duties of faithful subjects and good citizens. . . . No Christian community need fear the loss of its privileges or its rites. We have just ordered that on the occasion of the death or resignation of a Uniat parish priest, the community must be interrogated as to the rite and the priest that it prefers, so that it may obtain from the authorities the priest it desires.

The real fate of the Uniat Greeks in the territory ceded to Russia was, however, made plain by the frightful massacres which immediately followed in the Ukraine. Catharine let loose wild bands of Zaporog Cossacks, who pillaged and murdered in all directions. It was an awful visitation for the Roman Catholics of both rites, and is rightly styled by M. Rambaud, the popular French historian of Russia, a "jacquerie orthodoxe." These ferocious bands of

¹² The cynical attitude of Voltaire toward all noble patriotism is only too well known. Numerous revolting specimens of it may be seen in the work of M. Nourisson, "Voltaire et le Voltairianisme" (Paris, 1896), c. VII., "La patrie," pp. 336-374. Of the first partition of Poland he writes (May 29, 1772): "My heroine (Catharine) has acted in a more noble and useful way, by destroying the anarchy in Poland. She has given to each one what she thinks belongs to him, beginning, of course, with herself." Elsewhere he calls himself her "idolater," her "pagan," "the priest of her temple." She is "Sainte Catherine" and "Notre Dame de Pétersbourg." And this foul-mouthed avaricious man, servile at once and blasphemous, dared to preach of justice and equity, to denounce tyranny and oppression, to set himself up as the apostle of liberty! It is well known how disgusted Catharine became with the French Revolution, and how violent was the reaction which its excesses begat in her mind.

¹³ Martens, "Recueil des principaux traités," II., 149, and Theiner, "Documents annexés à l'Allocution de SS. Grégoire XIV., prononcée dans le consistoire secret," 22 Juillet, 1842, n. 3.

brigands, headed by Russian monks, swept through the Roman Catholic settlements, killing and burning. Even old men, women and children were pitilessly slain. On the same gallows were frequently hung a Pole, a Jew and a dog. Men were burned or buried alive and pregnant women were disemboweled. In a few days fifty villages and three cities were reduced to ashes. In one city of the territory of Kiew 16,000 persons were put to the sword and a well choked with corpses of tender children. It is said that as many as 200,000 Roman Catholics of both rites perished in this incredible onslaught of Russian fanaticism.¹⁴

The second partition of Poland (1792) was a still more cynical act than the first. The Poles in the meantime had begun the long-delayed work of creating a constitutional State in the modern sense, with an hereditary monarch, a bicameral system and separation of the legislative, executive and judicial powers. All Europe applauded, even Frederick William II., the successor of the great Frederick. He even allied himself with Poland for a brief while, but the advantages of the partition were still too fresh in the minds of Prussian statesmen, and the Russian thirst of violent and vindictive conquest still too unabated to permit the Polish nation to take its place in the modern world. A new excuse was added—the fear of encouraging the world-wide proselytism of the French Jacobins. In spite of the bravery and patriotism of Kosciusko almost every feature of the campaigns of 1768-1772 was repeated by the Polish nobles—discord, treason, jealousy, fear of their own serfs. As at Radom and Warsaw, so now at Grodno (1793) the members of the Polish Diet were compelled by Russian authority to give a silent consent to the act by which Russia added to her domain one-half of Lithuania, with Little Poland, Volyhnia, Podolia and Polish Ukraine. Prussia acquired Great Poland and the cities of Dantzic and Thorn. Once more the Russian Ambassador was omnipotent at Warsaw—this time the brutal Igelström. The shadow-king Poniatowski ruled nominally about one-third of the ancient State of the Jagellons. Czartoryski and Radziwill, Branicki and Potocki, Sanguisko and Joblowski had done their fatherland to death by reason of their insane attachment to the most disorderly and antiquated forms of feudalism, their selfish contempt for the great mass of laboring Poles, their mutual jealousy and their frequent alliances with the foreign enemy. One last hopeless attempt of Kosciusko and a despairing faction of the people, and

¹⁴ Père Lescoeur (op. cit. below, p. 7) vouches for the authenticity of a letter of Catharine to Maximilian Zelezniak, a colonel of the Cossacks. M. Rambaud calls it a "prétendue lettre de Catharine," but admits that it was read to the Cossacks. It is a sanguinary appeal, perfectly in keeping with the character of a murderess and a debauchee.

all was over. *Finis Poloniae!* the hero cried, as he fell fighting against the greatest of Russian generals, Suwarow (1794). Warsaw succumbed, and with it the Polish State. The following year a third and last partition gave Cracow to Austria with other territory, Warsaw and the left bank of the Vistula to Prussia. The remainder fell to Russia, *i. e.*, the other half of Lithuania and what remained of Volhynia. Thus was accomplished the greatest political injustice of modern times, the disruption and extinction by a "*societas leonina*" of a civilized Christian State of Europe that had rendered countless services to all her Western neighbors through the centuries of their weakness and their gradual consolidation. In vain had Poland hurled back nearly a hundred invasions of pagan tribes and Moslem enemies, in vain raised the siege of Vienna (1671), in vain withstood the overflow of Protestantism, in vain made heroic efforts to re-create herself amid the most untoward circumstances—it was all of no avail; she perished, not so much because she was weak and obstinate, divided and wrong-headed, as because she was a Catholic nation, and because the latter half of the eighteenth century was to be the darkest period in the history of Catholicism. The clear proof of it is that throughout the nineteenth century the history of both Prussian and Russian Poland has been the history of oppressed and abused Catholicism, a long chapter of national martyrdom that our delicate modern ears may well listen to from time to time amid the outcries against China and the protests against the Ottoman Turk.

III.

Poland in the first half of the eighteenth century was the most extensive State in Europe—if we except Russia. To the east the Duna and the Dnieper flowed through its territory, to the west the Vistula and the Wartha. It reached from the Dniester and the Carpathians to the Baltic, where its possessions cut in two the State of Prussia and threatened both Russia and Sweden. Brave warriors of the Crown of Poland and Duchy of Lithuania had put together that vast State, largely at the expense of Russia, but also at the expense of the Southern barbarian pagan and the ever-threatening Turk. It is a glorious and romantic chapter of history how all this was gotten and kept, and a certain unity brought about in government and civilization, alas! too slight and superficial to withstand the fierce shocks that were to rend the land again and again until its total ruin. The population was thin and scattered, from fourteen to eighteen millions of people scattered over vast level areas (*polé*—plains—Poland), interspersed with forests, lakes

and swamps, such as Gustav Freytag and Sienkewicz have described in immortal pages.

Politically it was made up of strictly Polish lands, known as the Crown of Poland and of the territory known as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Ethnographically it was inhabited by no less than five races—Poles, Lithuanians, Russians, Germans and Jews. Three religions divided the allegiance of the people—not to speak of the Jewish religion. With a few exceptions the Poles were Catholic, the Germans were Protestant, the Russians originally “orthodox” (schismatic). Since the Union of Lublin (1569) an uneasy peace had existed between the Catholics who formed the vast majority of the population and the dissidents (Protestants and Russians), who formed the minority—perhaps one-quarter of the nation. The Union of Brest (1595) brought a great multitude of the Russian schismatic population within the pale of Roman Catholicism. To this desirable result the Jesuits had contributed more than any other body of men. Their stupendous success in arresting the Reformation in Poland, their political services to the Crown, their merits as educators of youth and as representatives of literature and intellectual refinement, made them at once passionately loved of the nation at large and with equal intensity detested by the Lutheran ministers and the Russian “Popes.” In one sense it is true that Poland paid with the loss of its nationality for the incomparably greater gift of the Catholic faith. It was the Protestant Dissidents, sustained by Prussia, dwelling generally in the larger and more orderly cities of Poland like Dantzic and Thorn, who were the most turbulent disturbers of the internal order, and who left no stone unturned to ruin their fatherland and destroy the State of the Sigismunds and the Sobieskis.

A strong royal authority was needed in the seventeenth century to weld these loose and discordant masses. For various reasons, some of them honorable, it did not develop. The monarchy remained an elective one, the gift of the nobility, and one of the most curiously constituted of European nobilities. It was allodial, not feudal, *i. e.*, it held its lands by right of prior possession or personal conquest, and not from the King. Nor was the nobility systematically graded and organized as in the States to the west. In Poland proper an almost countless body of small nobles—the *szlachta*—was the true political power; in Lithuania it was the great magnates. Military “confederations” and more or less irregular assemblies or “dietines” were their highest expression of unity—the nobility of Poland aimed at keeping down the peasantry and weakening the royal authority. There was a representative Parliament or Diet, composed of two chambers, in the lower of which

the small nobility was dominant through its deputies, while in the upper—the Senate—the magnates were supreme. The royal ministers were named for life, and were duplicated for each half of the kingdom. At each election of a King the successful candidate must sign certain *pacta conventa*, by which the royal authority gradually dwindled away—eventually it was a painted simulacrum, totally dependent on the Diet. The ministers of the Crown, holding for life, are free to obey or not as it suits them; the “dietines” can reject by a single veto or *perhorrescit* the decisions of the Diet. The Diet itself can be “broken” by the *liberum veto* of a single noble member. From 1652 to 1704 forty-eight of the forty-five Diets were thus “broken” or dissolved; any traitor or fool could arrest the national life and obstruct all movement. To the Diet one might lawfully oppose the “confederation”—only here the decisions were taken by simple majority and no veto was allowed. It has been well said that “in Poland it was the opposition that was organized, while the government was anarchic.” The nobility was the nation—there were neither an independent peasantry nor a class of intelligent and patriotic burghers. The nobility itself was unevenly balanced. Four or five quasi-royal families, like the Radziwill and the Czartoryski, with splendid castles, vast domains and small standing armies, stood at the head of the State. After them came a dozen or more great families descended from royal dignitaries, then two or three hundred families, owning very large estates. Some twenty or thirty thousand nobles were masters of a village or two. Finally came the great mob of the *szlachta* or “little gentry,” about 1,300,000, known to the Germans as Schollen-Adel, from the insignificant clod of earth that too often constituted the estate of the *szlachic*. It was said that when the *szlachic*’s dog lay down in the midst of his master’s land his tail rested on the estate of a neighbor.

All sources of revenues in the State were taken up by this poor and hungry aristocracy—clerical dignities and benefices, public charges, the judicial offices, even the legal profession. They were exempted from taxes and obtained free salt from the King’s only source of revenue, the salt mines of Wieliczka. The German cities like Thorn, Dantzic, Culm and Magdeburg had a higher and more settled civil life, and enjoyed their own rights and customs. The Polish cities like Gnesen, Posen, Cracow and Plock, the Russian cities like Kiew and Smolensk, and the Lithuanian cities like Wilna and Grodno, were inhabited largely by Jews, in whose hands were industry and commerce, banking and the collection of taxes. There was almost no Polish Catholic bourgeoisie; the tyranny of the nobles had nearly everywhere killed off all spirit

of progress and prostrated all national industry and commerce. The once free peasantry was gradually enslaved and bound to the glebe. In time even the King was forbidden to protect him, and so he became a chattel of the Polish noble. Indeed, he owed the first improvement in his lot to Russia, and not to his native master. In 1778 an English traveler declared that the peasants of Poland were the most wretched human beings he had ever seen. The peasant had "ni loi ni roi;" the consequence was that his strong arm was wanting in the hour of national defense, and the State fell that had known how to do great military deeds, but had not known how to protect the poor Christian man or do him justice.

If we add to this wretched picture of maladministration and lack of justice the miserable condition of the finances and the army, we shall cease to wonder why the bravery of the Polish nobles failed to save their politically decadent nation. In 1764 the King received from Poland a little over one million dollars, from Lithuania less than four hundred thousand—all his revenues did not amount to more than two million dollars, or one-sixtieth of the revenues of the King of France. His land was open on all sides to invasion; his army was only the "levée en masse" of the noble cavaliers, who stayed with him or returned at their pleasure. Every smallest noble was a royal elector and a little sovereign, who came and went as best suited him. Such as the army was, the small nobles eagerly grasped at all the military offices; the regiments were bought and sold; the artillery corps counted scarcely 100 men, and a boy of 15, a Sapieha, was chief artilleryist! The arsenals were empty, there were almost no fortresses in a land on all sides exposed to the longing greed of its enemies. "Every citizen was a soldier, yet there was no army." Nevertheless, a Radziwill could lead 10,000 men to the Confederation of Bar, and a Czartoryski and a Potocki could also muster many thousands—infantry, uhlands, dragoons and Cossacks.

It ought not to surprise us, therefore, to read that on six or more occasions since 1518 the question of partitioning Poland had been discussed among her neighbors—at least, in every election of a Polish King, Russia, Prussia and Austria, France and Sweden are more and more openly interested and further, now by intrigue and seduction, again by threats and actual violence, the claims of their respective candidates. Usually it is the candidate of Russia, Prussia or Austria who is chosen, where-upon all Europe breathes freely at the removal of the war scare that in the eighteenth century was more or less chronic apropos of the Polish succession.

IV.

Among the articles of the treaty of Grodno (1793) that regularized the second partition of Poland was one that guaranteed the religious liberties and rights of the Roman Catholics, this time with specific mention of both rites:

The Roman Catholics of both rites who come under the sceptre of Her Imperial Majesty shall not only enjoy the full and free exercise of their religion throughout all the Russias, in conformity with the system of toleration that has been introduced there, but they shall also be secured in the ceded provinces . . . in the strictly actual condition of their hereditary possessions. *Her Majesty the Empress promises, irrevocably, for herself, her heirs and successors, that she will forever maintain the said Catholics of both rites in the undisturbed possession of their prerogatives, properties and churches, the full exercise of their worship and discipline, and of all the rights attached to their worship.* She declares for herself and her successors that she will never exercise her sovereign rights to the prejudice of the Catholic religion of both rites. (Theiner, op. cit. II., 110.)

But who even then imagined that this agreement would be observed by an unprincipled daughter of Anhalt? She had been brought up in the principles of German Lutheranism (*cujus regio illius religio*), and had in any case long since bade adieu to any sense of shame or Christian morality. Moreover, she was only too anxious to cause domestic oblivion of her own evil deeds by leaving a free hand to the immemorial hatred of the Byzantine clergy of Russia, and by the encouragement of an unjust and ignorant popular fanaticism against the Poles. The Banquo-like ghost of her murdered husband and predecessor, Peter III., would not down among his outraged subjects—so she found a new vent for the anger that threatened herself on all sides. The “Rusky Bog” should be glorified,¹⁵ a crusade against the Latin West be led in His name, Holy Russia be faced toward Jerusalem (and Constantinople), its hegemony established over all the Christian populations of the Balkans and the empire of Constantine be renewed in the successors of the Romanoffs! In the soul of Catharine there dwelt beside the superficial pseudo-humanitarianism of the encyclopedists no little of the uneasy political mysticism that the Czars had inherited from their Byzantine models, likewise a very large measure of the contempt and hatred of Rome that the clergy of Constantinople had for cen-

¹⁵ The Rusky Bog (Russian God) is the national form of jingoism or chauvinism. “It is something,” says Padre Tondini, a most authoritative and not unsympathetic writer about Russia, “akin to the temper of Israel when it interpreted materially the glorious spiritual prophecies that God had made to it. It reads and interprets all history in the light of a divine vocation for Russia as the head of the Orient, apart from and every way superior to the Latin West. The only unity of the West is in the Pope; therefore is he the enemy of the Czar and the rival of the Russian people. But this God of Russia has always used the Roman Bishop as an instrument for the execution of His designs upon His chosen people!” Cf. P. Semerla, “La Chiesa Greco-Russa,” Genova, 1904, p. 31.

turies maliciously nourished in the Russian heart against the day when that clergy would be itself powerless to propagate the evil virus.¹⁶ If we add her Protestant German training and sentiments and her total absence of moral principle, we shall be able to understand a priori the animus of her dealings with the great masses of the Roman Catholic population who were now completely at her mercy.

The principal weapon of Catharine was an entirely new one in the varied history of European politico-ecclesiastical diplomacy: she confided to a shameless traitor the highest ecclesiastical authority over all her Roman Catholic subjects.¹⁷ Thereby she avoided a conflict with an honest episcopate, confused the clergy, encouraged the self-seeking and unworthy among them, robbed the Uniat Greek laity of all free contact with the source of Catholic strength—the Holy See—and established an absolute Catholic Pope of her own making and ever under her own control. Scarcely had she acquired her share of the first partition of Poland when of her own initiative and without any Papal approval she created in the annexed White Russia the episcopal see of Mohilev, and gave over to it the jurisdiction over all the Roman Catholics of Russia. She named as its first titular a man whose memory will always be abhorred not only by Roman Catholics, but by all who admire the natural virtues of probity, candor and equity. Through this pliant agent she became herself the Bishop of the unfortunate Uniats and taught many a lesson of advanced cunning and boldness to the shade of the Virgin Queen, hitherto her great counterpart in all public and private "villenia."

Stanislaus Siestrenczewicz Bohusz was born in Lithuania, of Cal-

¹⁶ Cf. Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," Paris, 1858, and the epoch-making "Photius" of Cardinal Hergenroether (Regensburg, 1867-1869, 3 vols.).

¹⁷ It is well to remember that among the Polish clergy, even before the partition, not a few were reputed inimical to the Holy See. Stanislaus Konarski, provincial of the Piarists (Fathers of St. Joseph Calasanctius, who died in 1648; they were active in Poland since 1641, and are properly known as "Regulares pauperes Matris Dei schoiarum piarum"—hence "Piarists"—after the Jesuits, the chief educational force of the ancient Polish state), was an admirer of the contemporary French philosophy and author of "Religion des honnêtes gens," and an outspoken opponent of the Papal Nunciature. Among the higher ecclesiastics not a few were Freemasons; Count Podoski, the unworthy primate of Poland, and several of its Bishops were staunch adherents of the principal anti-Catholic measures. Cardinal Hergenroether, "Kirchengeschichte," III., 593-594; cf. Theiner's "Histoire de Clément XIV.," 1852, I., 314; II., 179, a very copiously documented work, "aber mit feichthem oft leidenschaftlichem Raisonnement geschrieben" (Card. Hergenroether, op. cit. III., 455). The Polish episcopate, like all other offices of any pecuniary value, had been entirely reserved to the nobles of the State; the parochial clergy were reckoned among the serf-peasantry and excluded from all ecclesiastical promotion.

vinist parents, in 1731. He made his studies at the University of Königsberg, also at Frankfort, Amsterdam and London, at the expense of the Calvinist Synod of his native place. He became an officer in the Prussian army, and later a captain in the Polish army, whence he passed to the service of the great house of Radziwill. It is said that his subsequent abjuration of Calvinism was due to certain hopes he entertained of marrying a rich Catholic heiress. Massalski, the Catholic Bishop of Wilna (then Polish territory), took an interest in him and ordained him priest in 1763. Later he was made parish priest, canon of the Cathedral and vicar general. In 1773 Massalski had obtained his promotion as Auxiliary Bishop of Wilna, with the purpose of providing for the spiritual needs of the territories newly annexed to Russia and still ecclesiastically subject to the diocese of Wilna. It was here that Catharine found him, another Thomas Cromwell, able and unscrupulous, and as devoted to the cæsaropapism of Catharine as he was inimical to the rights and interests of the Holy See. Though a born Pole, he had always fought against the interests of his fatherland, and was therefore doubly recommended to the Empress. The Holy See at first refused to acknowledge the act of Catharine in making Siestrenczewicz Bishop of Mohilev, but in the interests of the unhappy vanquished recognized him as vicar apostolic or rather, with canonical precision, as "visitator" of the churches of White Russia. He came to Mohilev in 1774. His first pastoral letter revealed the spirit in which he was to preside for fifty years over the affairs of Roman Catholicism in Russia. He declared himself the supreme pastor of all Roman Catholics in White Russia, and, by an unjustifiable usurpation, claimed jurisdiction over all the Bishops *in partibus* resident in that territory. The Papal Nuncio, Garampi, felt obliged to regularize temporarily these acts of Siestrenczewicz, as he was in need of his aid in order to execute the Papal bull suppressing the Jesuits. Later on Pius VI., caught between the dying agonies of Poland and the growing despotism of Catharine, was also compelled to yield from time to time and legalize the many acts of violent usurpation committed by Siestrenczewicz.

Thus, in 1778, he invested him, for three years, with the authority of Papal "visitator" over the Roman Catholic monasteries (chiefly Basilian and Uniat). An upright and worthy Catholic Bishop would have utilized this office for the welfare of the Church. Siestrenczewicz administered it in the interest of Russian ecclesiastical supremacy. Under the pretense of improving ecclesiastical studies he compelled the monasteries to furnish annually a certain number of students who were freed from the control of their superiors, placed under the surveillance of the Bishop of Mohilev, and sent

to such schools as he should designate, to return or not, as each one chose, to his monastery. This order implied the ruin of all monastic life and discipline. Were it not for the permission accorded to the Jesuits to open their own novitiate at Polock the treasonable plan of Siestrenciewicz would have succeeded. The real purpose of his programme of studies, dictated to him, of course, from St. Petersburg, is revealed by the following article (25):

The programme of studies to which the communities shall conform and of the languages that they shall teach shall not differ from that transmitted and prescribed by the government. It is the duty of the latter to form in its subjects an identity of sentiments and knowledge, in keeping with the laws and the circumstances of the country. We are convinced, on the other hand, that our Empress, given her exalted wisdom and the entire loyalty of her promises, will not oblige us to teach anything contrary to our religion.

He was hitherto, in the eyes of the Holy See and the Catholic world, only a "visitator" of the Roman Catholics of Russia. Catharine gratified his ambition and satisfied her own resolution to get rid of any Polish clerical authority in the annexed provinces, by creating him Archbishop of Mohilev, in a ukase of January 26, 1782. She had already (1780) sought in vain from Pius VI. the confirmation of this intended step. In the meantime an ex-Jesuit, Benislawski, was sent to Rome to obtain the confirmation of the imperial ukase and his own nomination as coadjutor to Siestrenciewicz. Benislawski had a Catholic heart, and his elevation did tend to heal somewhat the grave wounds that Siestrenciewicz continued to inflict on Roman Catholicism throughout all Russia. The harshest Byzantinism of Catharine awoke no resentment in the Archbishop of Mohilev. In the ukase of his nomination he read and applauded the thirteenth article:

It is forbidden to receive bulls and briefs coming from Rome in the name of the Pope. These bulls and briefs should be at once sent to the Senate. The latter, when it is satisfied that they contain nothing foreign to the laws of the land or the God-given authority of the monarch, will make them known to Her Majesty and await her good pleasure to publish them.

The preceding article (12) was also very injurious to the welfare of Roman Catholicism in a land like Russia and the ancient Russian provinces of Poland, where the monasteries had from time immemorial been intimately connected with the spiritual life and the temporal well-being of the poor and suffering peasantry:

The Archbishop shall send to the court a detailed account of the condition of the religious houses. He will make known how many devote themselves to the education of youth; how many to the care of the sick and the poor, and thus deserve the protection of the government; also who are those who pass their time in idleness and live a way quite useless to their neighbors.

In the hands of the Archbishop of Mohilev this meant the keeping of a "liste noire" of all the Roman Catholic monks of Russia, with all the evils consequent upon such a wretched system of

espionage. Indeed, from this time there went on a constantly increasing persecution of all the monasteries of men and women until at the present writing one may say that the once widespread Catholic monastic system of spiritual service, instruction, prayer and charity is about extinct throughout the entire Russian share of the old Polish State.¹⁸

Pius VI. recognized finally the archiepiscopal see of Mohilev by the bull *Onerosa pastoralis officii* (April 15, 1783), after all due canonical measures had been arranged with the Papal Nuncio at Warsaw. He also agreed to the choice of Benislowski as coadjutor of Mohilev, but reserved to himself any future division of an archdiocese that reached then to the confines of China. He accorded to the missionary prefects of Moscow, Petersburg and the Chersonesus seats in the chapter of the new Archbishop. He granted to Siestrenciewicz ordinary jurisdiction only over the Roman Catholics of Latin rite; for the Uniat Greeks he received only delegated powers. This did not prevent him from assuming the office and airs of a spiritual dictator and furthering in all possible ways the will of Catharine and the long-cherished designs of her imperial chancery.

He placed himself particularly at their disposal for the purpose of exterminating the Uniat Greek communities and incorporating them with the Russian ecclesiastical system. This was, indeed, the ultimate aim of all his acts, or rather of all the measures that the imperial chancery executed through him as through a soulless and spiritless dummy. He was a very ambitious man, and gave himself out as the sole metropolitan of both rites throughout the vast empire of Russia. In public documents he wrote himself down with unblushing mendacity a "legatus natus a latere" of the Holy See. Through the intercession both of Catharine and of Paul I. he sought to obtain a Cardinal's hat. This last insolent humiliation both Pius VI. and Pius VII. firmly resisted. He died in 1826, having betrayed both officially and outrageously every interest of the Roman Catholic Church since 1772, *i. e.*, for forty-

¹⁸ The Russian Government has declared an open war against all teaching orders like the Jesuits, the Piarists, the Lazarists. No convent can devote its labors to the teaching of youth, not even the Sisters of Charity, who are only tolerated. Their novitiate is suppressed; they are cut off from the authority of the Lazarists, and from all French direction. Those who were still living in 1860 were old and feeble, confined to hospital service and incapable of any of the services that Catholics might rightly expect from Sisters of Charity. At that date the religious orders in the old Kingdom of Poland could yet receive novices; it is the Russian purpose to first totally exterminate Roman Catholicism in the provinces annexed to the empire. In the meantime it affects a show of relatively less iniquitous measures in Poland proper. Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe," Paris, 1903, pp. 158-159.

four years. To her greater sorrow, however, his mantle fell upon another Pole who was, if possible, a still greater traitor—Joseph Siemachko—and to whom was also granted an exceedingly long life of official villainy (he died only in 1868).

V.

After the third partition of Poland (1795) an act of supreme injustice was committed by Catharine, with the approval of the Archbishop of Mohilev. She placed all Roman Catholics in her vast dominions under the control of the "College of Justice" established by her for the affairs of Inland, Esthland and Finland, *i. e.*, for entirely Protestant territory. The Catholic discipline was surely in capable and worthy hands after that measure, and the Semiramis of the North might feel satisfied that she was observing with punctilio the treaty of Grodno made two years earlier (1793), in which she promised "irrevocably" to maintain the "free" exercise of the Catholic religion for both rites. It is true that after her death Paul I., moved by the gross injustice of this act, withdrew the Roman Catholics of Russia from the control of this anomalous bureau of Russian schismatic laymen, and created a Roman Catholic "College of Justice," but always with Siestrenczewicz at its head. It was the nucleus or first shape of the later "Catholic College," or department of worship that has since been adapted again and again to the needs of Russian diplomacy, but remains yet an instrument of humiliation for all Catholics, and of oppression for the persecuting Russian State.

In his history of Roman Catholicism in the domains of the Czar an authoritative Russian statesman acknowledges that the purpose of Catharine was the complete exclusion of the Pope from the exercise of any disciplinary authority over the Roman Catholics of her empire, especially any influence of the higher Polish ecclesiastics and the Nuncio at Warsaw. She accomplished the revolution, he admits, by prohibiting the publication without her consent of any Papal communication with the Roman Catholics of her State. At the same time, he adds, she guaranteed *liberty* of worship and *organized* the administration of the Roman Catholic Church. It would be hard for Count Tolstoi to contradict himself more clearly and to exhibit more effectively the mendacity and hypocrisy of Catharine. He admits that no Pole or even impartial European has yet had the courage to do justice to that "grande souveraine," but maintains that she saved Roman Catholicism in Russia by the institution of a strong local authority and the establishment of regular dioceses. It is only necessary to say that her conduct

resembled the play of "Hamlet" with *Hamlet* left out—the administration of the Roman Catholic Church being as much a part of its essence as its teaching. The Febronians and Josephites of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries cannot answer the arguments of the Russian statesman; that is reserved to those who maintain the divinely-given independence of the Holy See. Tolstoi lauds to the skies the character of Siestrenczewicz, his curbing of the monastic independence and his reformation of ecclesiastical studies, especially his introduction of the *Catéchisme de Montpellier*—a work put by Rome on the Index of forbidden books. He is particularly pleased with the programme of the Archbishop of Mohilev for the teaching of canon law—it *was to be taught within the limits traced by Her Imperial Majesty for the Catholic Church within her empire and protected by her*. The idea of Siestrenczewicz is thus emphasized by Tolstoi himself, who thereby exhibits his clear intelligence of the consequences of this most cowardly and shameful act that a Catholic Bishop could imagine, short of formal apostasy.¹⁹ This author, speaking in the name of all Russian diplomacy, recites with approval all the blameworthy acts of the Archbishop of Mohilev, and with a truly Byzantine cynicism taunts contemptuously the Holy See with its approval of many acts of the traitor, an approval, as we have seen, granted as a lesser evil and in view of the great sufferings of the oppressed Catholics of both rites; at a moment, too, when the Holy See could no longer appeal to a single Catholic State for any political support. We may here insert a passage from the famous letter of Catharine to Pius VI., in which, with unparalleled audacity and insolence she demands for the Bishop of Mohilev the archiepiscopal pallium:

"As to the person of the Bishop Siestrenczewicz, Illustrious Sovereign, accused of having exceeded your rescript and of abusing the power you gave him, we will not leave unanswered this accusation. Though we tolerate, as did our ancestors, all forms of worship in our vast provinces, and among them the Roman religion, we cannot consent that its votaries should in any way whatsoever depend upon a foreign power; hence throughout our empire we do not permit the bulls of the Roman See to be published except by our order." That is why, she adds, Siestrenczewicz was able to open a Jesuit novitiate, in spite of the Pope, and by her orders. The bull of Clement XIV. suppressing the society had not been published in Russia. "Is it possible," she goes on, "that in the accomplishment of the duties of his oath he could incur your reproaches and make himself unworthy of receiving from you the archiepiscopal dignity and the pallium? That dignity, being a degree of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, has always and everywhere been subject to the sovereign power, even among potentates of the Roman Catholic religion, rulers who hold themselves in a measure as subject to the Papal authority in spiritual matters. This sovereign right is especially incontestable in our empire. Impelled by his zeal for the Roman Church, for the perfect administration of his flock, and for all his efforts in favor of public unity, we have determined to elevate Siestrenczewicz to the

¹⁹ Ap. Lescoeur, p. 30. The memoir of Siestrenczewicz referred to by Tolstoi is printed by him (II., 436) from the original in the archives of Moscow, and is entitled "On the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the Empire."

dignity of Archbishop of Mohilev. . . . We pray you, Illustrious Sovereign, merely in order to preserve the customs of the Roman Church, to send to the new Archbishop the pallium, and to consecrate his coadjutor. We shall hold this an agreeable condescendance on your part, and in turn, when occasion offers, we shall not refuse to reciprocate the courtesy. We unite our prayers with those of our orthodox Church, which offers up its petitions for the reunion of all."

This letter, swarming with lies and historical ignorance, was written to the heroic Pius VI. in favor of a Roman Catholic Bishop on the morrow of the first partition of Poland and on the eve of the French Revolution. In it there speaks not so much the heart of Holy Russia as the embittered Lutheran, rejoicing in the hour when she can inflict on the head of Catholicism a disgrace that knows no parallel, and which was mitigated by only one consideration—the sense of helpless innocence on the part of the recipient. It may not be out of place to compare with the Siestrenczewicz of Count Tolstoi and Catharine the portrait of the Archbishop as he appeared in 1819 to that great upright nobleman of the old school, Joseph De Maistre. Siestrenczewicz was then nearly ninety years of age—he died (1826) at the age of 96:

There is now in Russia a very curious personage, who could belong to no other time and place than the present. It is the Archbishop of Mohilev, Catholic primate of all the Russias, a Protestant and a cavalry officer before being made a Bishop, an instrument in the hands of our enemies a thousand times more dangerous than a professed Protestant, so servile, moreover, as to disgust a noble power which is satisfied with obedience, always ready to contradict and, if need be, to oppose the Holy See, because he is sure of being supported. It is he who once said in court, as the Emperor passed by: "There goes my Pope!" The witnesses of that admirable profession of faith are yet living at St. Petersburg. This strange Bishop undertook one day to falsify a text of the Council of Trent and another text taken from a letter of Pius VI. For this double "fault" (one had to be satisfied with this word) the actually reigning Pope (Pius VII.) could not refrain from writing him a brief in which he blamed him with much severity, and ordered him to make a retraction. But the Bishop of Mohilev, knowing that he was safe, laughed at the brief and made no retraction of any kind. To crown his merits, this prelate has become a member of the Bible Society. . . . A Catholic Bishop as a member of the Bible Society is something so monstrous that it defies expression. The Pope sent to this singular prelate another brief, which he heeded no more than the preceding one; his conduct merited (imperial) approval. That is how a Catholic Bishop is sustained (in Russia) against the Pope. It is the abolition of all order, as though the officers of a regiment were declared free of any subordination to their general. It means the annihilation of Catholicism.²⁰

²⁰ "Lettres et Opuscules," II., 389, Paris, 1861. Père Lescoeur, from whom I translate this page, adds (p. 27): "One must read this whole letter of De Maistre on the condition of Christianity in Europe. All that he says of the Russian Church is literally true to-day, and would of itself be sufficient to illustrate the real and fatal situation of Catholic Poland in the eyes of Russia; the latter refuses to comprehend any other solution for the Polish conscience than a schismatic break with Rome." Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe," Paris, 1860, new edition, 1903 (Librairie Plon), a work that only needs an index to be an excellent account of the dealings of the imperial Russian chancery with the Holy See from the first partition of Poland to the year 1875. The author says (p. 1): "On aurait pu le prolonger et le continuer jusqu'à ce jour; car malgré la différence profonde des temps, nombre de justes griefs sont restées les mêmes ou se sont renouvelées. Il en serait bientôt tout autrement si une législation

The first partition of Poland brought to Catharine, among other territories, that of Little Russia, and with it 1,800,000 souls, mostly united Ruthenians belonging to the diocese of Polock, one of the suffragans of Kiew, to which metropolitan church there were subject at the time Lemburg and Przemyśl with a part of Chelm. The latter districts had the good fortune to fall to Austria, and as a result there are yet in Austrian Poland some 3,000,000 Ruthenian Catholics, with nearly 400,000 in Hungary. Poland herself for a while held the metropolitan church of Kiew with several suffragan dioceses. However, with an insignificant exception, the remainder of the Ruthenian Catholics fell to Russia in the course of the second and third partitions. This population, more genuinely Slav in blood, habits and speech than any other part of Russia, had been reconciled with Rome by the Union of Brest in 1595, thereby re-knitting old ties of union that dated from the tenth or the eleventh century and had been interrupted only by the malice and hatred of the clergy of Constantinople during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²¹ The lands of Little Russia had fallen to Poland by conquest in the course of the sixteenth century. In 1720 the famous Synod of Zamoisc (in Lithuania) had regularized their ecclesiastical affairs and relations, though in the years immediately preceding the first partition of the kingdom the metropolitans of Kiew had not been always worthy of their office. Moreover, the

nouvelle venait à se créer plus conforme à l'esprit nouveau." I have drawn largely on it for the documents and for several appreciations in the preceding pages.

²¹ Many important ancient documents concerning the original relations between Rome and the Slavs are found in Theiner, "*Vetera Monumenta historiam Poloniæ et Lituaniæ illustrantia*," 2 vols. fol. Rome, 1860; also in Bielowski, "*Monumenta Poloniæ Historica*," vol. I.; cf. Frind, "*Kirchengeschichte Boehmens*," Prague, 2 vols., 1862-1866. Two admirable works of Tondini resume for the general reader much ancient ecclesiastical history of the Slavs: "*La Primauté de S. Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'Eglise Russe dans sa liturgie*," Paris, 1867; "*Le Pape de Rome et les papes de l'Eglise Orthodoxe*," Paris, 1874; cf. also Dom Guépin, "*Saint Josephat Kunccewitch, archeveque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'Eglise Grecque unie en Pologne*," Paris, 1874. The studies of the Bollandists on the lives of some of the earlier Slav saints illustrate quite fully this point of history, e. g., "*Diss. de conversione Russorum*," in *Acta Sanctorum* for September (vol. II.). The pages of De Maistre in the "*Soirées de St. Peterbourg*" on this subject remain always authoritative and convincing. Cf. Lescoeur op. cit., pp. 523-528. Lengenich, "*Dissert de religionis christianæ in Polonia initiis*," Cracow, 1734; Leporovski, "*De primis episcopatibus in Polonia conditis*," Herbpol, 1874. Bonet-Maury, "*Les premiers témoignages de l'introduction du christianisme en Russie*" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*), 1901, p. 223, sq. Palmieri, "*La Conversione dei Russi al cristianesimo la testimonianza di Fozio*," in *Studi Religiosi*, 1901, p. 153 sq. Veredière, "*Origines Catholiques de l'Eglise Russe*," in *Etudes de Théologie* (Paris, 1857, II., 133 sq.), and *ibid* Gagarine, II., 75; Hergenroether-Kirsch, "*Kirchengeschichte*" (ed. 1904), II., 280-286.

Russians, often quartered upon their territory, had made clearly known the fate reserved to the Catholics once they were gathered under the sceptre of "divine" Catharine and her successors.

After the first partition Catharine forbade her Ruthenians all communication with Rome and even with their old metropolitan church of Kiew (being yet a part of Poland). It was only in 1795, however, when the last spark of Polish independence was extinguished that she began her barbarous work of exterminating Roman Catholicism. Here, too, her most useful agent was Siestrenczewicz, "a man who caused more damage to the Catholic Church of both rites in Russia than all the schismatics."²² But her immediate instrument was Stephen Bulgari, a Greek adventurer from Corfu and a one-time friend and courtier of Frederick II., from whose service he had passed to that of Catharine. He proposed the establishment among the Ruthenians of a college of Russian "Popes" under a Greek Bishop. The suggestion was acted upon, the missionary college was richly endowed and Victor Sardowski, archimandrite of Sluck, made its first president. At once throughout the extent of the ancient metropolitan district of Kiew began endless acts of violence, deception and cruelty. All the old Ruthenian sees on Russian territory were suppressed, with the exception of the archiepiscopal see of Polock, the Bishops deposed and banished; with particular hatred it was decreed that Kiew should never more be an episcopal see. Its last metropolitan died at St. Petersburg in 1798, a pensioner of the Czar, two years after the death, in the same place and estate, of the last King of Poland! The former Catholic parishes were converted wholesale by force and by lies, the priests were exiled or abused and their families divided and persecuted. Catharine wrote the Pope that the people were free to choose their own pastors. She did not say that this was done by the village authorities, and that the latter were compelled to act as the Russian State dictated to them. All churches that had been built before the union with Rome in 1595 were declared Russian churches, and their populations incorporated with the State church. It was decreed that no new parish could be founded unless it counted one hundred "hearths;" and that all parishes below that number would be considered as integrant parts of the Russian Church. As the villages of these territories are thinly peopled, the result was a general destruction of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system. The parishes were broken up, the churches confiscated or abandoned, the priests driven away and often ruined by the confiscation or forced sale of their property. It became impossible for the Ruthenian Catholics to attend their few churches in the winter, by reason of the great distances that separated them. And all this time the heavy hand of Siestrenczewicz was oppressing everywhere through-

²² Fr. Neher in Wetzer and Welte, "Kirchenlexicon," VII., p. 442.

out the land the Basilian Uniat monasteries in the name of a higher secularized education, while the Ruthenian Catholics of his vast diocese were perishing for want of a defender. All this time he was flattering the Empress and defying the Pope and excogitating fresh schemes for enslaving the Latins and compelling the Uniats into the deathly schism they had happily escaped from. Catharine did not live to finish her work; she died in 1796, three years after the treaty of Grodno. Those three years, however, were enough to reduce the number of Ruthenian parishes in the dioceses of Kiew, Luczk, Kamienitz and Wladimir from five thousand to one thousand. She withdrew from the Roman obedience eight millions, and was therefore, since Martin Luther, the most successful enemy of Roman Catholicism; all the more so as with regard to our religion it is her principles, precedents, laws and spirit that have ever since dominated in the land of the Muscovite ²³

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

²³ The reign of Catharine II. marks the first period and, so to speak, the first act of the long drama of religious oppression which began for Poland on the day of her national downfall, a drama that is being daily unrolled and always, despite the differences of men and times, with the same characteristics above, an unintelligent russophile patriotism, kept alive by the statesmen who make use of "Pravoslav" fanaticism as a means of paralyzing the best intentions of their master, below, an army of subaltern agents, violent men of shameless cunning and often of savage cruelty. . . . The legislation of Catharine II. and her executive measures have remained the finished type and unchangeable model for all attempts at the annihilation of the faith of Catholic Poland. Père Lescoeur, *op. cit.* pp. 13-17.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

ONE of the things which strikes an observer most in Ireland to-day is the extremely small provision made by its rulers for the higher education of its people. In no other country is its importance more clearly recognized by the population, but in none is there less public effort to provide it. Trinity College is certainly an imposing mass of buildings, and it possesses large property, numerous professors and a considerable body of students, but the latter are almost exclusively drawn from a class limited to an eighth of the population of the country, and the control of studies and revenues is in the hands of a small close corporation drawn from the same class, distinctively hostile to Irish national aspirations and recruiting itself as vacancies occur in its membership by arbitrary coöption. There is no other residential university in the Irish capital. There are several schools of medicine and a college of science, under control of the English commissioners, in South Kensington. There is also a university college, housed in some buildings that were formerly private houses, but otherwise one seeks in vain for institutions of the higher learning in Dublin.

Nevertheless, there is no country in which the need of educational training, intellectual and scientific, is greater than in Ireland to-day. The want is recognized by all classes of the population and admitted time and again by their rulers, but almost nothing has been done during the last forty years to give any practical supply of the want. Mr. Balfour, the present Prime Minister, confesses it to-day, as Gladstone did twenty-seven years ago, but measures to remedy the existing state of things are ever deferred by those in authority. Twenty years ago Sir Lyon Playfair stated the case clearly in the British Parliament. He declared, without reply, that "the competition of nations now was not one of brute force or local advantages, but of intellect, and foreign nations recognize this fact. The nation best educated will be the greatest, if not to-day, surely to-morrow. Before the war with Germany university education had fallen so low in France that the State support given it was less than fifty thousand dollars annually. After that war the French Institute had discussed for two weeks the question why France had shown an intellectual paralysis during its continuance, why no great leaders had appeared in the moment of danger, and the answer given that it was because the higher education of the nation had been grossly neglected. France now (in 1885) spends two and a half millions annually on university

education. Germany has twenty-four universities and spends three million dollars a year on them from the public revenue. Holland, with a population like that of Ireland or Scotland, spends nearly seven hundred thousand dollars annually on its four universities." In the face of these facts, stated by one ranking among the highest educational authorities in England, it is well to examine what provision was then made by the government for the higher education of the four millions of Irish Catholics subject to its rule, and what it has since done for their needs.

The last point can be answered so easily that it may be done at once. During the past twenty years the Administration of Ireland has conceded the salaries of six additional teachers, amounting to about ten thousand dollars annually, to the needs of the Irish Catholics, three and a half millions of people, for modern higher education. The burdens of Irish taxation in the same time have been increased by about ten million dollars for imperial expenditures. The facilities for acquiring higher education in Ireland to-day are practically what they were twenty years ago, and no more.

There are at present two university bodies in Ireland with the legal power of granting degrees. The older of the two, or Dublin University, is so closely connected with Trinity College as practically to depend on its authorities. The college proper is a close corporation, ruled by a board of eight senior fellows and a provost. The senior fellows hold office for life, and vacancies in their ranks are filled by them from a body of thirty junior fellows, who themselves are also selected by the board from the graduates of the college. With the exception of the ecclesiastical seminaries like Maynooth and Clonliffe, Trinity College is the only university institution in Ireland which has buildings and grounds to accommodate resident students, like Oxford, Yale or Harvard. Those of Trinity are on a scale of completeness equal to any of the English or American universities. Over a thousand students can be lodged within its rooms, its library is the largest in Ireland, and its lecture halls and laboratories are on a scale of magnificence unsurpassed in the British Empire. This college and university are directed by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church exclusively.

The value of its buildings and gardens alone are estimated, conservatively, at a value of five million dollars, and the college further owns estates of about two hundred thousand acres, or one per cent. of the whole area of Ireland. Its yearly revenue from this source, independent of students' fees, was until lately reckoned at fifty-five thousand pounds, or nearly three hundred thousand dollars. The senior fellows receive, or did till lately, incomes of ten thousand dollars each, and the provost, thirty thousand, with an extensive

residence. The professors and tutors also receive very large salaries, and numerous scholarships, sizarships and prizes are distributed among the body of students. The latter at present number about a thousand, but they are almost exclusively drawn from the members of a single religious denomination, and it is a denomination which reckons less than an eighth in the population of Ireland. The governing board of senior fellows is exclusively Episcopalian, and it has the legal authority to select all future members. The thirty junior fellows, chosen by the seniors as the body from which their own ranks are to be selected on occasion, is also exclusively Protestant, as are all the professors of the college. One, and only one, nominal Catholic has been elected a junior fellow during the three centuries of the existence of Trinity College without a formal renunciation of his faith. That exception was the late Professor Maguire, who won unpleasant notoriety about ten years ago as one of the principal agents in the plot of the *London Times* to ruin the character of Parnell and other Irish members by the Pigott forgeries. Mr. Maguire, it may be added, was not a native of Ireland.

The circumstances which have given a close corporation of eight individuals control of the only residential university of Ireland and its endowments throw a curious light on the practical value of reforms carried out under the present administration of the British Empire. When Mr. Gladstone disestablished the State Church, thirty years ago, the national funds for university education were looked on as part of its corporate property as well as the tithe charges for public worship. The Prime Minister recognized the injustice of leaving the former under control of a petty denomination, but he seemed incapable of devising any method for restoring them to the use of the general public. He simply transferred Trinity College and its property to the body ruling it at the time, with the sole condition that it should not publicly establish any religious test for admission to its fellowship or professoriate. The existing fellows were left absolute discretion to admit members for the future, and they have since used that discretion to exclude Catholics from any part with their own co-religionists in control of the college or its property. As a natural consequence scarcely any Catholic students can be found to attend its courses, except to a limited extent in the medical department. As far as the higher education goes the Catholics, who form seven-ninths of the Irish population, receive scarcely more profit from Trinity College than they do from the University of Berlin or Vienna.

The second university body existing in Ireland is the Royal University, established by Gladstone's government somewhat over twenty years ago. It has taken the place of another body, known

as the Queens University, which had been in existence with little result for about thirty years previously. The Royal University is only an Examining Board and has no connection directly with any teaching institution. It is governed by a Board of Commissioners named by the British Ministry and has funds of a hundred thousand dollars a year at its control. From this a body of thirty fellows, selected by competitive examination, are paid salaries of two thousand dollars each. Their duties are to conduct yearly examinations in the various university branches and to teach at other times in colleges to which they may be assigned by the Governing Board. Fifteen are so assigned to the Catholic University College in Dublin, the others being employed in the Queens Colleges and elsewhere. The salaries of these fifteen professors are the sole public contribution given to the Catholic population for university education at present. They represent a money value of about twenty-two thousand dollars.

The work of the Royal University is limited to preparing courses of studies for degrees and examining candidates in these courses on a uniform plan. It has charge of professional as well as literary and scientific education and grants degrees in law, medicine and engineering, as it does the ordinary university degrees. It is with the latter we are chiefly concerned in this sketch, as it is by them the modern intellectual development of the different classes of the Irish people can best be traced. The professional schools in Ireland are practically supported by the fees of those attending them. There are several long established medical colleges besides those connected with Trinity College, the Catholic University College and the three Queen's Colleges. The students of all are equally eligible for the degrees of the Royal University. The students for the Church ministry, Catholic or non-Catholic, are a numerous body in Ireland, and of course receive a training of university character, but they have no connection with the Royal University, except as far as individuals among them may seek degrees in its faculty of arts. Trinity College maintains a divinity school for the exclusive benefit of the late Established Church body. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church supports another in Belfast, the majority of its students attending the secular courses of the Belfast Queens College. These two classes furnish about four hundred students, who are reckoned officially among the attendance of the two colleges just named. The Catholic ecclesiastical students are not reckoned as university men in any official statements, though receiving a university training in practice. Between Maynooth, Carlow, Kilkenny, Clonliffe, All Hallows and other seminaries they probably number over a thousand, independent of the students belonging to

the various religious orders, who must be from three to four hundred.

It is needed to keep this point in mind in forming a correct judgment of the numbers of the various classes of the Irish population represented in university education. The Catholic priests trained in Maynooth or Carlow have practically the same literary and scientific training as the Protestant ministers educated in Trinity or the Belfast Queens College, but in official statistics they are never reckoned as university men, while the latter are. This fact tends to give an undue impression of the comparative numbers of the highly educated classes among Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants respectively. How serious the error may be can be reckoned by the Parliamentary constituency of Trinity College, which alone in Ireland has the right of electing members to represent its graduates in the Imperial Parliament. Its electors are those who have received the university degree of master of arts. They number four thousand two hundred, and of those no less than twenty-six hundred are clergymen of the Disestablished Church at the present time.

Apart from the seminaries and professional schools there are at present in Ireland four colleges outside Trinity devoted to the higher education. They are the Queens Colleges of Belfast, Cork and Galway, and the Catholic University College of Dublin. In some other institutions there are small classes or isolated students following a university course, but the four just named are the only ones provided with a full staff of professors for such course in arts and science as laid down by the Royal University. The three Queens Colleges are supported by the public funds and directed by the British Ministry. The Catholic University College was built by private subscription, and with the exception of the salaries of part of its staff is supported entirely by the same and the fees of its students. It is important to compare the value of each of these institutions for the intellectual development of the Irish people, which is amongst their most vital needs to-day.

For the comparison a sketch of the origin of all four is necessary. The three Queen's Colleges were projected by the Ministry of Sir Robert Peel in 1845 as a concession to the demands of the Irish people outside the then Established Church to a share in university education without having to seek it from a distinctly Protestant institution. The members of the Established Church at the time numbered less than one-eighth of the whole Irish population. More than seven millions of Catholics and dissenting Protestants were without any college for the higher studies in Ireland, and the injustice was recognized even in England. It was nearly five years,

however, before the promises of the Ministry developed into tangible shape, and during these five years the population in question had been reduced by nearly a quarter through the dread famine. The Queen's Colleges were finally organized in 1849 and set in operation two years later as "undenominational" university schools, without any religious test for either attendance in their classes or occupancy of their chairs. What "undenominational" means in English official minds may be gathered from the teaching staff provided by the Prime Minister of the day, a distinguished Liberal in profession.

A sum of about two hundred thousand dollars annually was appropriated for teachers and scholarships in the three colleges, and buildings for them erected in Belfast, Cork and Galway at a further cost of about half a million. The Ministry named the heads and twenty professors for each college in the various courses, without other test than the discretion of the Prime Minister. In Cork, the capital of Munster, where ninety-seven per cent. of the population was Catholic, a Catholic, Dr. Kane, was appointed head, but not a single Catholic professor in the faculty of arts. Two in the medical department and one in the legal were the only Catholic professors in this undenominational college for nearly two millions of a Catholic population. In Galway, for the even more Catholic province of Connaught, Lord John Russell named two Catholics among the twenty professors. In Belfast, the college to provide for Ulster's educational needs, the case was even stranger. The majority of the population of the province was Catholic, and of the Protestant minority not much over one-half was Presbyterian. Sir Robert Peel in 1845 communicated to the House of Commons, when discussing his bill to furnish Ireland with a "non-sectarian university," a communication which he had received from "a Presbyterian clergyman of high character," with apparent assent to its requirements. It ran thus:

"Sir John Graham appears to have intimated that all religions would be represented among the professorships. Now I should be acting most unfaithfully to the government did I not clearly express my conviction that *one Roman Catholic* or Unitarian professor in the essential parts of the undergraduate course would at once decide the General Assembly to withdraw every student. You might, indeed, appoint an Episcopalian, not known as a Puseyite, as readily as a Presbyterian or a Baptist, Independent or Methodist, without much dissatisfaction, but not a Unitarian or a Roman Catholic professor."

To appreciate the intolerant insolence of this statement it must be remembered that the Presbyterians in Ulster formed barely a

third of the population whose educational needs were to be provided for from the public funds, apart from the monopoly enjoyed by another section of Protestants already established. Sir Robert did not think it needed to consult the wishes of the Catholic majority in any way on the subject, but gave the Presbyterian General Assembly a "very strong assurance" that their wishes would be complied with. That body in consequence in 1849 graciously passed a resolution endorsing the proposed non-sectarian college in the following terms:

"Whereas, Her Majesty's Government have enabled us to provide for the religious instruction of all our students in the endowment of a theological faculty under our own jurisdiction, and, whereas, the qualifications and character of the persons appointed in the Queen's College of Belfast, for the classes which the students of this Church are required to attend, are such as to justify this Assembly in accepting degrees from that college, we now permit them to attend the classes of that department in the college."

The Presbyterian Assembly has since had no grounds to withdraw its patronage on account of "non-sectarianism." Its head, Dr. Henry, was named president of the college, and during the fifty years since its foundation not a single representative of the Catholic majority in Ulster has been allowed to occupy any chair whatever in its halls. The Catholic population, it need hardly be added, has also remained outside. In 1889 there were just eleven Catholics among a total of four hundred and twenty students. The yearly grant of sixty thousand dollars has, however, been steadily continued for the support of Belfast Queen's College as a distinctively non-sectarian institution.

In the Cork and Galway Colleges there was absolutely no non-Catholic body which could demand to control the nomination of professors, but the English Ministers have spontaneously followed a scarcely less rigorous exclusion of Catholics from their teaching staff, and Catholic students have, almost as consistently, kept aloof from their teaching. As there were scarcely any but Catholics to draw on for students, the colleges themselves have since been almost useless in any educational sense. They receive, nevertheless, an equal share with Belfast from the public funds for professors and scholarships. The latter, in fact, are nearly as numerous as the students enrolled. In 1897 Cork College had a total of thirty-one students attending its courses in arts and Galway fifty-three, though each offered scholarships of an annual value of fifty-six hundred dollars to be divided among this scanty flock. Part of this number, it may be added, is made up of strangers from Ulster, who feel that their Presbyterian scruples are equally free from danger in

the non-sectarian institutions of the Catholic cities as in Belfast itself, even though a rare Catholic may lecture on mathematics or law in the former. Belfast College itself is as completely left to the control of the Presbyterian General Assembly as Trinity College is to its Episcopalian Board of Fellows. Its present president is a Presbyterian minister named, according to the statement of Mr. Balfour, on the request of the Presbyterian clergy.

The Catholic University, or as it is now called, "University College," was founded by the Irish Bishops shortly after the Queen's Colleges had been opened. It was first recommended by the Synod at Thurles in 1850 as an urgent national necessity. Funds to provide the buildings and pay the professors were collected during the next three years, and the university was opened in 1854. During the following twenty-five years annual collections were made through the churches for its maintenance, the total amounting to about an average yearly of forty thousand dollars. The first rector chosen was John Henry Newman, afterwards Cardinal. He consented to devote seven years to the work of its organization, and remained until that term was ended, in 1859. The first teaching staff was mainly selected by him and the courses of studies framed under his direction on the models of Oxford or Cambridge Colleges in general lines.

The quality of instruction offered by Dr. Newman's college was certainly equal to that of the endowed Protestant university, but the number of students drawn to it was limited. The poverty of the Irish Catholics debarred the majority even of its brightest young men from the time and cost needed for a three years' course of studies, with no financial return at the end. The tradition of giving a university education to their children had no existence naturally among the wealthier Irish Catholics who had been debarred from it themselves during so many generations. The new college had no means to offer scholarships or prizes, like those of Trinity or the Queen's Colleges, to students of talent, but without wealth. However, it attracted a much larger number than the two colleges of Cork and Galway, and at least as many as Belfast. Ten years after its foundation it counted three hundred and fifty attendants. About one-half were attendants at evening classes and over a hundred medical students, but about ninety took the full course of arts. It was a beginning not unsatisfactory among a population debarred from higher studies during many generations. The teaching staff was admittedly of the highest character for scholarship. It was drawn largely from the most distinguished men of Oxford and Cambridge, mixed with Irish names like those of W. K. Sullivan, the favorite pupil of Liebig; of Aubrey de Vere

and Denis Florence McCarthy, the translator of Calderon. Pierre Le Page Renouf, described by Lord Acton as "without question the most learned Englishman he had known," was professor of ancient history and Oriental languages. Casey, the greatest mathematician of Ireland; Eugene O'Curry, the first of Celtic archæologists; Ornsby, who was later chosen to direct the education of the Duke of Norfolk; Robertson, the historian, and Sigerson were among the teaching staff of the Catholic University.

It continued its work almost unnoticed for twenty-eight years, during which Trinity College and the Queen's University continued to monopolize the entire of the public funds for higher education. The Queen's Colleges utterly failed to attract Catholic students. They had hardly an average of a dozen such each on their rolls during all these years, and the entire number of Catholics receiving university education in Ireland was hardly a quarter of the students of the Protestant Trinity College. The authorities of the latter professed to see in that fact evidence that their Catholic countrymen were intellectually their own inferiors, and had neither capacity nor desire for serious studies. This theory was highly popular among all classes of Irish Protestants and received credit in England and elsewhere abroad. Some thinking men, however, felt that other causes fully accounted for the small number of Catholic university students in Ireland. The relative poverty of the Catholic population as a whole, a direct result of centuries of proscription, was one. The monopoly of the rewards for learning and the professoriate by the Protestant minority was another, and the limited number of Catholics in the professional classes, whose members everywhere furnish the largest proportion of college students, a third. This last, like the first, was a direct result of the old conditions of the penal laws. In a country like Ireland, where there is little external commerce or change of population, it is a work of more than one generation for a class long held in enforced ignorance to rise to practical equality. It was only at the beginning of the last century that the Irish Catholics were allowed even to open schools, and down to near its close all public foundations remained in possession of the minority. Carlow College and Maynooth were the only public schools of the Irish Catholics at the close of the eighteenth century. Besides Trinity College, the members of the State Church held all endowments for secondary education throughout the country. Their revenues were reckoned at four hundred thousand dollars and furnished so many inducements to Protestants to take up the studies which directly led to their possession. The Catholic majority had to build their schools from their own scanty resources before they could give their children the opportunities for learning

to which the dominant class had been used for eight generations of Protestant ascendancy.

The work of building them was kept up unnoticed for many years. In 1834, five years after Catholic emancipation, there were twenty-three Catholic higher schools, with fourteen hundred pupils, in Ireland. The distinctively Protestant institutions of the same class numbered ninety-six, with forty-two hundred scholars, or just three times the number of Catholic students. The disproportion was terrible, considering that the Catholics formed three-fourths of the Irish population. By 1861 the census showed eighty-six Catholic to sixty Protestant colleges, and an equal number of pupils in each class. The returns of the intermediate examiners, in the closing years of the century, showed the proportions to have changed, so that the number of Catholics receiving secondary instruction was then two to one. It may take some years before it takes the same proportions as the Catholics occupy in the general population, but that result seems sure to come. Whether an equal advance will be made among those receiving university training has yet to be decided. To bring that to pass it seems needed that the existing monopoly of the public funds by non-Catholic institutions be abolished or equal amounts be provided for education of the Catholic section of Irishmen in a manner suited to their wishes.

A measure adopted by the British Ministry in 1879 as an experiment gave remarkable evidence of the work done in education by the Irish Catholics unaided by the State. A body known as the Intermediate Education Board was appointed to examine publicly all pupils of schools above the grade of "national" or primary. It received funds to the amount of twenty thousand pounds yearly to hold such examinations, award prizes and scholarships to a limited number of the best students and publish the results. No distinction was made on the ground of religion; the subjects tested were simply those of secular knowledge. The Protestant endowed schools were admitted to compete equally with the unaided Catholic and private schools. The result was wholly unexpected. The number of pupils receiving a secondary education in 1860 had been only half Catholic. The examinations of the Intermediate Board during the last ten years have shown that twice as many Catholics as non-Catholics passed their tests. The latter, it may be said, in the middle grade are equal to an ordinary university matriculation. Sixty-six hundred in all have passed this test in the last ten years. Forty-three hundred and twenty came from the self-supporting Catholic schools. Of the prizes awarded three hundred and ninety out of a total of little over six hundred also were taken by the Catholics. Of the ten highest in each year eight were from the same body.

The theories of intellectual inferiority of Irish Catholics or inefficient teaching of Catholic schools have since been almost silent.

Three years later, in 1882, the Royal University was established by Mr. Gladstone to extend a like system to the students of university standing through Ireland. It does not teach, but it examines and awards a certain number of scholarships to those most successful in its standards. Students from the endowed Queen's Colleges, from the Catholic University and from any other institutions were called to compete on their own merits. The first examination placed the latter at a marked disadvantage in the standing of its students apart from numbers. Its courses had to be suddenly changed to suit the programme of the Royal University, which itself was modeled on that already in use in the Queen's Colleges. For this reason only three candidates for the third year or "bachelor's degree" were sent in by the Catholic college against forty-five furnished by its rivals. The total number of candidates from the Queen's Colleges who passed the Royal examinations was a hundred and ninety-seven, against eighty from the Catholic college. In the list of honors, however, the students of the latter showed an unlooked for superiority. Belfast College, with a hundred and forty students, gained one hundred and five distinctions; Cork's non-sectarian institution, with twenty-eight students, won twenty honors, and Galway's, with thirty, only eight distinctions. The eighty Catholic University students captured ninety distinctions, and further, in the subjects of classics and modern languages they won fifty-four honors, leaving only forty-eight to the two hundred Presbyterian and non-sectarian colleges.

This remarkable showing was followed by increased success in the following years. The Catholic College in 1896 had doubled its attendance, while its highly endowed competitors had scarcely maintained the numbers of their first year. The arts course of Belfast was only able to recruit a hundred and twenty-two students after ten years, Galway had fifty-three and Cork thirty-one. Catholic University College had over a hundred and sixty. It is remarkable, too, that it had drawn a much higher percentage of non-Catholic students than the non-sectarian colleges had Catholics. Cork had only six of the latter, Galway eighteen and Belfast five, while the Catholic College had nineteen Protestant students on its rolls. The Queen's Colleges had the advantage of a hundred and five scholarships of an annual value of about twenty thousand dollars for division exclusively among their own students. In Cork the scholarships were actually more numerous than the students invited to win them, and only four of the thirty were unprovided with them. It is suggestive of the sincerity of the

opposition of the great body of the Irish population to the non-sectarian teaching offered them by their rulers that among the two hundred and six students of the Queen's Colleges there were only twenty-nine Catholics. The unendowed Catholic College had nearly six times that number on its rolls, of whom a hundred and forty-four were Catholics. If the total seems small for the general population, the poverty of that population must be borne in mind.

It would be too long to trace the numbers of students in the various colleges year by year, and it seems as though those given were substantially an average of the last ten years. The Catholic University attracts five-sixths of the Irish Catholic students who seek university education and also a larger percentage of non-Catholics than the Queen's Colleges do of Catholics. The teaching staff of the latter is predominantly non-Catholic. Catholic teachers are absolutely excluded from Belfast College, and are only employed to the amount of a tenth in the two non-sectarian colleges of Cork and Galway. The relative numbers of the students in the Catholic institution and the three non-sectarian colleges is about as four to five. It is interesting to see how the two bodies compare in educational efficiency under these conditions.

From the returns of the Royal University during the ten years ending with 1903 it appears that sixteen hundred and fifty distinctions of all kinds were won by the four colleges. Of these Cork gained sixty-five, Galway two hundred and fifty, Belfast six hundred and thirty and the Catholic University seven hundred and four. Those distinctions are of two grades of merit, known as first and second. Of the first or highest three hundred and forty-eight were divided by the three State institutions and three hundred and seventy-four taken by the Catholic College. Among the first class distinctions a special class is given to the bachelor scholarships, the studentships for masters of arts and what are known as first class honors, prizes for exceptionally high answering at the second and first year examinations. Of these in all twenty-two were awarded during ten years. Fifteen were taken by Catholic University students and seven by the three non-sectarian colleges. The latter combined also won twenty-nine scholarships and thirteen studentships. University College, with four-fifths of the number of their students, took thirty of the former and fourteen of the latter. Two special studentships in biological science were offered during the ten years and both were taken by Catholic students. They also carried off six of the eight special gold medals offered for English prose and Latin verse. It may be added that this year's examinations show four studentships awarded, the subjects being classics, mathematics, experimental science and mental and

moral science. All four were won by students of the Catholic University College.

Another remarkable fact bearing on the intellectual capacity of the students from Catholic and non-Catholic schools, respectively, has been brought by the published statements of the intermediate schools and Royal University combined. Of the senior grade students examined by the former during the last ten years a certain number, the highest in merit, were awarded "exhibitions" enabling them to support themselves, at least partially, through college for another year. The lists are published of those who won those exhibitions during the ten years ending 1898. The total number was a hundred and seventy-four, about a hundred coming from Catholic schools. Of the total a hundred entered Trinity College, Queen's Colleges or the Catholic University. Thirty-two joined the first, twenty-six entered the Presbyterian College in Belfast, nine—and only nine—the two so-called non-sectarian colleges in Cork and Galway and thirty-three the Catholic University. The calendar of Trinity College for the first year of this century shows that the intermediate exhibitioners who entered there were beyond comparison the best of its students. They won in competition that year nine of ten among the college studentships, sizarships and prizes offered. The prizes of this kind offered by Trinity were, of course, strictly confined to its own pupils, and the winners had not to compete for them with Catholic rivals. It is, however, a striking fact that the standard reached at the intermediate examinations by the students who selected Trinity and won its prizes was notably lower than that of the thirty-three who selected the Catholic University. The percentage of marks awarded by the Intermediate Board to the exhibitioners who afterwards enrolled in Trinity was slightly under an average of thirty-three hundred. The thirty-five who entered Queen's Colleges had thirty-five hundred and fifty, while the thirty-three for the Catholic University had won an average of thirty-nine hundred and forty marks. Their examination standard was twenty per cent. above that of the absolutely best students of the Protestant university.

These results speak their own story as far as the intellectual capacity of the Irish Catholics and the efficiency in a scholastic of the Catholic schools are concerned. They bring out further remarkable testimony of the determination of the Irish Catholics to seek education only under Catholic influences. Of those who entered Trinity and won its prizes only one professed himself a Catholic, of those to Belfast none and to Cork two. Nevertheless, Cork, Belfast and Galway each offered thirty-seven scholarships of greater amount than those already won from the intermediate to

exhibitioners who would accept their teaching. Trinity practically offered still larger inducements materially for matriculation there, but neither attracted Catholics of education and talent. Of the seventy-four intermediate exhibitioners of Protestant denominations not less than sixty joined Trinity and the Queen's Colleges and received from these institutions ample scholarships to support them through a whole university course. The thirty-three who chose the Catholic University elected to make their own way through it unaided, and only five Catholics were willing to enter the rival colleges. Of the other seventy-four exhibitioners, equal in capacity to those who matriculated in the five institutions just named, there would seem to be no less than sixty Catholics. Of the total seventy-four, thirty-five matriculated in the Royal University to follow its courses either by private study or as post-graduates in various colleges or seminaries. Thirty-nine made no attempt to follow university studies, at least not in Ireland. Much the larger number of both these classes were Catholics. Their capacity for university work was equal at least to that of the prizemen of Trinity, but poverty largely debarred them from pursuing it. The choice offered them was between un-Catholic universities or none, and the great majority chose the latter. The spirit which sways the bulk of Irish Catholics to-day in the matter of education seems precisely the same as made their grandfathers accept political disfranchisement rather than the Established Church. The policy of government that refuses them equality in educational funds is exactly the same as that which refused them a share in Parliamentary representation seventy-five years ago.

It is a dreary and ungracious task to have to dwell upon the grievances of a people and point out how illusory are the professions of liberality and boasts of progress made by its rulers, but it is a task that must be performed for the interests of truth. Public education in Ireland to-day is wholly inadequate to the needs of its people, and the cause lies almost wholly in its rulers. It is not in any indifference to its value on the part of the Irish Catholics, to any lack of capacity for it among them or to the inefficiency of Catholic schools and teachers. It is simply that the bulk of the public funds for the higher education are still reserved, almost as fully as during the penal code, for classes numbering little over a fourth of the population of Ireland. The monopoly was once with the single body of State Protestants, numbering an eighth of the whole. The funds enjoyed by it under that monopoly have been left to its members, but they have been supplemented by two other State endowed institutions equally distasteful to the bulk of the Irish people. The Presbyterian body, a tenth of the population,

has been provided with a college, amply endowed, from whose chairs Catholics are rigorously excluded. The political agnosticism now fashionable in England is given sway in two other colleges, where the immense majority of the teachers are chosen from every class, but those belonging to the faith of the Irish people. The solitary Catholic University receives no help except part salaries of fifteen professors. The Catholics in Ireland are to the non-Catholics as seven to two. The State grants them twenty-two thousand dollars annually for the higher education. It spends two hundred thousand on colleges of its own, two of which stand nearly empty, and it secures a single denominational body property worth ten million dollars for the benefit of its members.

There is, however, some ground for hope, even in the existing conditions, for the Irish Catholics. The progress made in the number and efficiency of their intermediate schools and colleges since emancipation is remarkable, considering the disadvantages of the Catholics in material resources. They then had scarcely a third of the number of such institutions monopolized by the Protestant minority. To-day they have double the number of the latter, and the efficiency of the Catholics is at least equal to that of their endowed rivals.

In university institutions, though the number of students is still wholly out of proportion to the Catholic element in the general population, the Catholic University has won for itself a name for scholarship equal if not distinctively superior to Trinity or Belfast. Its students in arts are more numerous than those of Belfast, more than double those of the State colleges at Cork and Galway and superior to either and to Trinity in the tests of practical studies. A result may fairly be looked for like that already gained in intermediate education. It will certainly come if the existing State monopoly in the Queen's Colleges and the Episcopalian monopoly of Trinity be abolished and their funds applied as fully to national use as those of the existing Intermediate Board.

It is especially satisfactory to note the comparatively large proportion of non-Catholic students attracted already by the Catholic University. The percentage is about half that of Catholics and Protestants in the whole population. In Belfast the percentage of Catholic art students is three per cent., though Catholics are fifty per cent. of the population of the province. In the Catholic University non-Catholic students are twelve per cent. of the whole, while they form only twenty-six per cent. of the whole Irish population. The contrast is indeed suggestive.

One of the most encouraging facts at the present time for the future of Catholic education in Ireland is the formation of a dis-

tinctive body of Catholic University graduates during the last twenty years. They are naturally not as numerous as those of Trinity, but they are either their equals or superiors intellectually, and they stand as representatives for three-fourths of the Irish people. The University College, though its buildings are owned by the Bishops as a corporation, is practically self-governing. It is not clerical in any professional sense. Its president is a Jesuit and some members of that order are among its professors, but its governing council is elected triennially from the whole body of professors, all of whom have been elected from graduates of the college. There are fifteen professors and six tutors or assistants. Five of them are priests, the rest laymen, and one or two non-Catholics. The governing council consists of six, five of whom at present are laymen and one a Protestant. The object sought by Irish Catholics is not proscription nor ascendancy. They demand simply that the public funds shall be shared equally between Catholic and non-Catholic teaching institutions on their educational merits. For the organization of their own universities they insist that they shall be ruled by academical bodies representative of Catholic public opinion and their teaching shall be such as the Church finds no reason to condemn. The independence in internal administration of the college they desire to be such as that enjoyed by the colleges of Oxford, Cambridge or Berlin, or the Catholic Universities of Belgium or Austria. The nucleus for such a university already exists in the Dublin University College.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Calif

THE ROYAL LINE OF SAVOY: THE PRINCE OF PIEDMONT.

THE names Humbert, Amadeus, Charles, Emanuel, Victor are the frequently recurring stepping stones which span a stream nearly a thousand years wide in the valley of European history.

Although the beginning of the house of Savoy as a ruling power is pretty clearly settled, its antecedent history can no more be traced to its real source than can the innumerable streams that rush down upon Savoy from the broad bosoms of the Alps that shelter and beautify it. Count Humbert of Maurienne is generally regarded as the founder of the present line. He was a stepson of Rudolph III., the Frankish monarch of Arles. Previous to his

time, however, there had been governors of Savoy taken from the house of the Counts of St. Maurice, and the name of one of these, Beroald, would suggest not a Roman but a Teutonic origin. Various tribes had successively dominated the valleys after and before the break-up of the Roman Empire—the Allobroges, Nantuates and others. Humbert, too, is a name suggestive of Teutonic origin, as is Rudolph, the King who first raised Savoy to the countship rank. These facts point to a German source for a line that was to endure for centuries, like the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs and the royal line of Bavaria, the Wittelsbachs. There is no distinctive family name in the Savoy dynasty, like these and several others.

It is a remarkable fact that it was in the bracing air of the Alps was found the inspiration of power and the genius to rule with success. Soldiers, statesmen and patriots of the first degree have opened their eyes in infancy on the towering peaks and verdant vales of the great mountain region—warriors like Henry of Navarre and patriots like Tell and Hofer. In this charmed air there seems to be a quality that links the spirit of command with the genius of liberty in a subtle combination, tempering valor with wisdom and suavity, so that under whatever vicissitudes of fortune perpetuity of leadership among men is assured to the pre-eminent gens by reason of intrinsic excellence as well as by claim of ancient heredity.

The royal house of Italy differs from other royal houses in regard to the title of the heir to the dignity. In England the eldest born is always the Prince of Wales; in France he is the Dauphin d'Auvergne; in Spain the Prince of the Asturias. It is a custom which long usage has solidified into the consistency of a law. But in the Italian house the case is the reverse. The King is the whole College of Heralds in himself; he chooses the titles, rights and prerogatives of all members of the royal line. All that is of settled precedent is that the rank of the heir is that of royal highness. The present King was, ere he acceded to the throne, the Prince of Naples; his father, Humbert, was, in his day, Prince of Piedmont. Political considerations have from time immemorial influenced the selection of the heir-apparent's title in the Savoy family. There is no other family, probably, that possesses so large and picturesque an assortment of titles from which to make a choice; and the motley gathering, like an array of ancient panoply in a feudal gallery, has an independent and romantic history for each separate weapon and suit of war harness. Some of these titles stretch back into the twilight of history—the dukedom of Spoleto, for instance, which dates back to the year 570 A. D., and had a Longobard origin. This title was bestowed upon the Aosta branch

of the royal house, as well as that of the dukedom of Apulia, which dates from the time of the Norman knight-errant, Robert Guiscard (A. D. 1048), and was bestowed by the Pope for services rendered in driving the Saracens from the south of Italy. The dukedom became a kingdom eighty years later, by reason of the success of Robert's descendants in clearing Sicily of the Saracen invaders, who had settled down there as though intent on a permanent occupation and rule. Turin, as capital of the realm for a long period, gave a title to many counts and dukes of the family. Piedmont, or at least a large portion of it, had come into the possession of the Savoy family through marriage as early as the beginning of the eleventh century. This territory became, a century later, a county of the German Empire, and Amadeus III. its vassal, with the title of Count of Savoy. Nice and Coni were successively annexed by his successors, the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth Amadeus; and in 1434, under the latter, Savoy was raised to ducal rank. The Marquisates of Susa and Saluzzo were likewise honors acquired by the flourishing house, either through marriage or conquest; as also the viscountship of Chambery, as well as the barony of Vaud and Faucigny, in France. There are innumerable other titles at the disposal of the head of the house of Savoy—nearly all acquired through successful marriages into other houses and the falling in of the territories and the titles into the main branch on the failure of the various indirect lines. The head of the house is also the titular King of Cyprus and Jerusalem and the Armenians. His right to the Spanish succession, by marriage, was recognized by the Cortes when it called the Duke of Aosta to the throne in 1871.

Although for the most part a peaceful race, there were many stout warriors among the Savoy princes. Of these the most celebrated were Amadeus V., who drove the Turks from Rhodes and was called the Great; Emanuel Philibert, who commanded the Spanish army at the battle of St. Quentin (1557), and Victor Amadeus II. The latter was enabled to recover all the family territory which a couple of unlucky predecessors had lost in war, and to gain besides part of the duchy of Milan and the whole of the Kingdom of Sicily. This latter he eventually exchanged for the Island of Sardinia, of which he became King. This was the first actual entry of the Savoy line into the domain of the royalties. It took place in the year 1720. Piedmont and Sardinia were united under the one crown until 1860, when the revolutionary movement in Italy enabled Victor Emmanuel, son of Charles Albert, to assume the title of King of Italy. This was the consummation of a dream for the realization of which his father had vainly struggled. That unfortunate monarch, urged on by the reckless Italian enthusiasts,

had been foolishly driven to war with Austria, and was disastrously defeated at the battle of Novara, in 1848. From this blow he never recovered. It remained for his son, Victor Emmanuel, to avenge the disaster by coöperating with France to drive the Austrians from the Quadrilateral.

It was the hope of the extremists in the Italian peninsula that the new heir to the throne would have bestowed on him a title that was never before borne by a Savoyard—namely, Prince of Rome. But the royal parents had the good sense and good taste to refuse to gratify this spiteful desire. Titles signifying sovereignty over Rome on the part of secular bearers are of evil portent. They are mere iridescent bubbles—a moment bright then gone forever—to vary slightly Burns' fine metaphor.

It was in Piedmont, at Racconigi, below Turin, that the Prince was born. This was in accordance with his parents' wish and the hope of the Piedmontese that a family tradition, though not an invariable one, might be respected.

Though the name Humbert is a favorite one in the family, because it was that of its founder, Amadeus is hardly less beloved, because it was that of his firstborn, and the most distinguished warriors and statesmen of the house have borne it. It was the name, also, of that luxurious member of the stock who was chosen by the minority of the Council of Basle to oppose Pope Eugene IV., whom they had formally pretended to depose as a heretic. Amadeus (he was the eighth of the name) on accepting the worthless nomination, took the name of Felix V. He was chosen, significantly enough, at a period when a pestilence was raging in the place where the unlawful council was holding its sessions; and he himself proved more or less of a pestilence to the Church, since there was no peace in it until he renounced the crown so illegitimately assumed. This he finally did, after a stormy nine years' pretense of rule, from 1439 to 1449. Amadeus had never received holy orders, and never made any pretense at living a sanctified life. He had made a marriage which brought additional territory to the already ample domain of Savoy; and his court was kept in a style of regal magnificence. On the death of his wife he abandoned the direction of affairs into the hands of his son and retired into the monastery of Ripaille. There he is said to have continued to indulge his luxurious Sybarite tastes so lavishly as to attract the attention of the surrounding country, until to live *à la* Ripaille became in the popular mouth a satirical synonym. It was thus he was living in retirement from the world when he was invited to assume the Papal dignity. His election was generally received with derision; only a few princes and bishops regarded it seriously, while the real Pope, Eugene, was on

the other hand supported by France, Italy, England, Spain and Hungary. Nevertheless, Felix continued to act as though he were the rightful Pontiff until Eugene died. The Cardinals in Rome having thereupon elected Thomas de Sarzana (Nicholas V.), Amadeus, or Felix, saw it was useless any longer to pretend to an unreal authority, and resigned the crown in Nicholas' favor. He was allowed to do so, however, on very easy terms, being appointed perpetual Legate in his late temporal dominions and given other extraordinary privileges in recognition of his high rank as a Pontiff, though an irregularly appointed one. So ended this visitation of moral plague to the Church for that particular period. Others were to follow in a short time, with results much more disastrous to the peace of Christendom.

Fortunate as the house of Savoy had been, for the most part, in acquiring new lands and honors, it was not until the reign of Victor Amadeus II. that it reached its apex of success. The long reign of this prince was full of adventurous enterprise. Not only was he enabled to retrieve a good deal of what had been lost by less aggressive predecessors, but he succeeded at length in achieving the summit of the house's ambition, the royal dignity. First he became King of Naples, but Sardinia lying nearer to Savoy, he exchanged his Neapolitan title for that of monarch of Sardinia, and the bargain was ratified by the signatories to the Treaty of London (1720). It was fortunate for the house of Savoy that the exchange was made; for later on the grasping French came on the scene, in the name of liberty, the royal family were driven from Piedmont, and among the people of Sardinia, whose affections the dynasty had gained by a wise and beneficent system of administration, they found not only shelter but valiant defenders. The French navy appeared on the coast in 1793; it bombarded Cagliari and attempted a landing at several other places, but the inhabitants everywhere resisted these efforts so obstinately that the spoilers were forced to relinquish their intended prey. Sixty years later the positions were reversed. The foemen of the earlier time became allies and drove the Austrians from the North of Italy; and the final outcome of these operations was the transfer to France of the ancient heritage of Savoy, in exchange for the duchies of Parma and Modena and the Kingdom of Sicily. Family pride should have forbidden the alienation of the country associated with the ties of nine hundred years. But sentiment must yield to policy in the dealings of the great; even religion has not infrequently had to give way to the material considerations of royal alliances.

Sardinia owes much to the house of Savoy. Previous to its coming under the sway of that wise and capable dynasty it was in a

lamentable condition of neglect and unproductiveness. For four centuries anterior to their advent it had languished under the blighting influence of Aragonese rule. There was no sympathy between the people of the island and its governors. The former were Italian, if not by blood, at least in language, to a large extent, and in spirit and temperament. The same motley admixture of blood is found in the chief islands of the Mediterranean—Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily—yet the populations of each seem to have been more affected by Italian influences than either French or Spanish. Hence the rulers from Piedmont and Savoy never experienced the resistance that the French did in Corsica; in fact, they were from the beginning welcomed as friends; and there never was any insurrection against their authority there, while in Corsica the hostility of a large part of the mountain population toward the French lasted down to the advent of Bonaparte as ruler of France.

Owing to the isolated position of Sardinia, the outside world really knew little or nothing about the island, in the past or the present, until the fortunes of war brought it into connection with Piedmont and the house of Savoy—a connection which has ever since been uninterrupted. When the union was affected, the long silence was broken and the light of inquiry began to reveal the many interesting things that had lain so long hidden under the mists of neglect and forgetfulness. All the large islands in the Mediterranean are teeming with interest, of many kinds, historical, ethnological, poetical and legendary. Sardinia is fully as rich in all these as any of the others—perhaps more so. These things were practically unknown to Europe until the advent of the Savoy princes. These brought progress, and they bade learning to rise and open the page of history and find what Sardinia was in the past and what she might aspire to be in the future. The first authority to call attention to its claims was the Cavaliere Giuseppe Manno, a scholar, a man of affairs and a keen wit, who was one of the Supreme Board of Sardinia which controlled its administration and watched over its interests in Turin after the incorporation of the kingdom with the duchy. The writer's position gave him access to the archives, both in the island and on the mainland; and these he utilized in the best way to the unfolding of a record full of varied interest to the historian and the statesman. His work was published in Turin in the year 1827, and was followed in 1831 by another giving fine views of Sardinian urban and rural life and the antiquities of the hitherto unknown island. From *Sardo*, the leader of a Libyan colony in remote pre-Christian days, the present name of the island is derived. Before his coming it was called *Ichnusa*. Strabo and Ptolemy, Pliny and Pomponius Mela men-

tion it as having been early colonized by Etruscans. In the palmy days of Carthage it was a dependency of that power. Afterwards it became a Roman colony. Christianity was introduced in the early part of the fourth century, when a Bishop of Cagliari is spoken of. But then came the Vandals, and with them persecution and martyrdom for the Christians for a long period, until the Emperor Justinian sent a Byzantine force to conquer the island and bring it peace. After several centuries of quiet, troubles again came with successive invasions of Longobards, Moors and Saracens. The latter got the upper hand after long conflicts, and retained their supremacy until the early part of the eleventh century. Then the Genoese and the Pisans, combining against the African enemy, swooped down and drove the garrisons out and divided the island between themselves and some Spanish and other adventurers who had thrown in their lot with them for the recovery of the island from the infidel. After the partition they quarreled among themselves, and there was another period of chaos, until the trouble was for the time settled by the division of the island into four jurisdictions, under rulers who were styled Judges. In the thirteenth century the Aragonese appeared on the Sardinian stage as supporters of the Judge of Arborea against the aggression of the Genoese and the Pisans, and stubbornly stuck to their footing until they had succeeded in reducing the whole island to a dependency of Spain, under the rule of a viceroy. This rule was, as all rule unbeloved of the ruled must be, fatal to national prosperity. Sardinia withered and sank into a condition of anæmia. Her population gradually dwindled, lawlessness reigned and the civic life of the country fell into a state of catalepsy. Such was the condition of affairs when the island was given into the care of the house of Savoy by the Treaty of London in the year 1720.

Here it is permissible to pause and consider the what had been and weigh it with the what might have been under other conditions. The means of making such an estimate are abundant. If Sardinia did languish under the soporific spell of Spanish rule, let us ask ourselves how she might have fared had she continued under the sway of either the Genoese or the Pisans. We have only to consider the fate of the various republics on the Italian mainland, to find a dismal answer to the inquiry. If the rule of the Spanish Viceroys was enervating, the fact was due to the indifference of the people themselves. Spanish rule gave them a representative government, in the shape of an elective assembly, called the *Stamenti*, in which the three orders—the nobility, the clergy and the people of the towns—were proportionately represented. Yet so little interest did the people at large take in their national par-

liament that it became in process of time little more than a cypher; the laws it enacted met with little or no respect; the system of legal redress for wrongs fell into desuetude; the musket or the stiletto was substituted for the court decree; whole districts, especially in the mountainous region, had shaken off all form of adherence to law, refusing to pay taxes or submit to any control; brigandage prevailed in many places, crime went unpunished, and save in the larger towns, a state of chaos and anarchy existed generally in Sardinia. Under this disastrous condition of things commerce languished and the population dwindled in proportionate ratio. The militia of the island, which in 1588 mustered 30,000 foot and 7,000 cavalry, had declined to 20,000 foot, though the cavalry had increased to 9,000. In 1814, after ninety years of the Savoy rule the militia had increased to 35,000 cavalry and 25,000 infantry—a very respectable army for an island of Sardinia's dimensions.

A surprising change came over the country under the rule of the first King, and the improvement thus begun was maintained and brought to a culmination under the reign of Charles Emmanuel III., who earned the appellation of "the Great," for his own wisdom and enlightenment as well as for the able ministers whom he gathered about him, especially his Prime Minister, Count Bogino, whose name is still venerated both in Piedmont and Sardinia. A sound system of administration was organized, upright magistrates were appointed, the law once more made itself feared and respected, criminals were duly punished and the depredations of the banditti checked. The King devoted much attention to the improvement of agriculture, of flocks and herds and the cultivation of the mulberry tree, which grows abundantly throughout Sardinia; commerce again filled the ports and marts; colleges and schools were set up; two universities were established, one at Cagliari and another at Sassari, and many fine works were issued from the printing presses in these now flourishing centres. This impetus continued down to the end of Charles Emmanuel's reign (1773) and even beyond that period, until it received a temporary check through the descent of the French upon the Italian peninsula and the aggression of their fleets in Italian waters. This aggression aroused the indignation of the islanders, and every attempt that the invaders made to obtain a footing on the coast was resisted with such desperate energy that the insolent foe was at last forced to abandon the project of an invasion of Sardinian territory.

The French were more successful in their aggression upon Piedmont. The royal family were forced to fly from the capital, Turin, and take refuge in Sardinia. Here they were received with affec-

tionate welcome, and the King, Charles Felix, and his successor, Victor Emmanuel I., devoted all their energies to the development of the island. The latter initiated measures which soon proved to be of vast benefit to the place. There had been immense tracts of land lying waste—common lands, as they were called—and these he caused to be enclosed and placed under proper cultivation. Soon these hitherto useless wilds were converted into thriving and blooming fields and gardens, and the owners of the large estates, taking the hint, began the introduction of improved agricultural methods, until all the island felt the benefit of the new impulse. Thus Piedmont's distress proved the crowning of Sardinia's resurrection; and from that period forward the country has made substantial progress. During the reign of Charles Felix schools were, by his decree, provided in every commune or parish where none had previously existed. All these schools were free. In them, besides the three R's, there were also taught religion, the catechism and elementary agriculture. This was as far back as the year 1820. So that Sardinia may be regarded as having been among the pioneers of the movement for a more enlightened system of modern education.

The literature and laws of Sardinia form a deeply interesting subject of study. The laws were the product of various eras and different systems of government, for as we have seen, the island had suffered many vicissitudes. Greek and Saracen had been its masters, at different periods; Roman and Carthaginian had drenched its soil with blood, during several centuries of war; the Vandal had trampled its harvests and abused its people; the Moor had swayed its destinies later on, for many more centuries, and finally the Spaniard had lorded it in Sardinia until compelled to loosen his grip by the treaty of London. These fluctuations of fortune were conducive neither to the growth of a distinctive literature, a distinctive people nor a distinctive judicial code. Yet, strangely enough, the physical characteristics of the people of this mixed blood are distinctive. The Sardinian is a good type of Southern Caucasian. His Grecian blood gives him his regular features; his Moorish strain his swarthy complexion. They are quick-tempered, like most Southern peoples, but they have virtues which counterbalance to a large extent, their flaws of character. They are honest and moral. They may kill a man for jealousy or to avenge family honor, but they will not rob or cheat. That is, the ordinary run of the population; there were banditti in the old times who lived by robbery and murder, but these gentry have long ago disappeared.

Down to the eighteenth century but little progress had been made in literature in the island, but since the advent of the house

of Savoy there has been a pleasing change in that respect. Possibly the history of the Cavaliere Manno was the most important work the island had produced down to his day. Fiction might naturally be expected to be prolific in a country so picturesque as Sardinia, and so full of materials for the production of romance. Yet nothing of importance had been evolved in that sphere down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Then an author of the first rank suddenly appeared on the scene—one who was by many critics esteemed fit to rank with Manzoni. Like Sir Walter Scott he preserved an incognito until he felt his fame assured. Then he was discovered to the world as Signor Varese. His best works were "*Il Proscritto*," "*Falchetto Malaspina*" and "*Preziosa di Santuri*"—all three being romances dealing with mediæval life in Sardinia. They were remarkable for their dramatic power both in construction and technique, and soon achieved a world-wide celebrity. To the outside world they were especially valuable, as the only source of light upon the early life of Sardinia down to that time available. The glimpses thus revealed disclose a people semi-civilized, or rather half barbarous, steeped in savage superstitions and presenting many features of resemblance to the Highland clansmen of Scotland, in their feuds, their passionate tribal attachments and their strange mingling of intense piety and childlike beliefs in witchcraft and the powers of evil. Some of the scenes depicted in "*Preziosa*" remind one very forcibly of certain weird chapters in "*Rob Roy*" and cantos in "*The Lady of the Lake*."

In mediæval Sardinia, as elsewhere, the practice of appeal to the ordeal for the settlement of legal causes was a recognized resort of litigants. Some English critics seemed to think that such a custom afforded proofs of a condition of barbarity rather than civilization, but they overlooked the fact that it prevailed in England itself down to a period far beyond the middle ages. In the sixteenth century, for instance, two Irish chieftains, who were rival claimants to certain lands, were allowed to decide their controversy by arms. The combat took place in the presence of judges of the law courts, and was fought in the court-yard of Dublin Castle. It is sought to cast a slur on the Church, too, by these hypercritical commentators because the ordeal was always begun by a religious service, each disputant appealing to the judgment of God as to the righteousness of his claim. It is only necessary to say that the civil law everywhere provided the forms of legal process and the methods in which appeals and penalties were carried out, and the only part that the Church had in such tragical scenes was that of affording spiritual consolation to the victims of the law or their opponents' superiority in arms.

The ordeal was of various kinds. There was the ordeal by water, for instance, open to one condemned to be burnt, as a means of proving innocence in cases of witchcraft; and there was the ordeal of touching the dead in cases of murder. These ancient customs are utilized with powerful effect in the pages of Varese. Many of his scenes are more thrilling in their tragic romance than the story of Verdi's troubador and his gipsy mother. One of his scenes in "Preziosa" depicts an ordeal by battle, interrupted and terminated by the interposition of a holy hermit like Telemachus, who brings with him a venerable reliquary and places himself between the combatants, daring them to profane the sacred object by the effusion of blood. In another scene, the heroine, Preziosa, saves herself from the stake by accepting the ordeal by water. She springs from a high cliff into the sea, and is rescued from death by her lover, who had hidden a boat near the scene of the trial.

The vendetta, or blood heritage, existed in Sardinia in much the same way as it did in Corsica. The mode in which the obligation was handed down is most graphically described in the pages of "Preziosa." In a revolt against the Aragonese one of the Viceroy's soldiers shoots the son and heir of the Capo-tribu of Genasgento, and there being no brother, the duty of vengeance falls on a sister, a little girl of ten. The body of the slain youth is laid out in state, his disconsolate father sitting beside it, and some women of the tribe, mourners of a professional kind like those who were known as "keeners" in Ireland, set up a chant in praise of the dead and grief for his taking off. This is, again, like the "coronach," or "lament" described in "Rob Roy." In the midst of this dismal plaint the young girl, Nura, the sister, who is dressed in her richest costume, but with hair hanging loose, approaches the bier, escorted by three of her kinsmen. She is made to dip her handkerchief in the blood of the deceased. Then, after the funeral is over, she is led to the house where her father has closed himself in, and throwing the gory handkerchief into his lap, she demands that he take up the task of vengeance which has devolved upon her, but which she is unfit, being a girl, to execute. Then one of the girl's cousins begins the task of reciting the usual formula, the girl, having fainted and invoked "the malediction of heaven upon his hoary head if he failed to bring down the assassin of his son;" and to this dreadful imprecation the old man has to respond "amen."

The savage notions of this period are exemplified in the existence as a separate class in Sardinia, to which those professional dirge-singers belonged. This class was known as the *accabaduri*—a word derived from another Italian verb signifying "to knock on the head." The men of this class were hired for purposes of murder,

just as the Venetian bravoës used to be; and the women earned something by their attendance at funerals. As it was well known that such was their avocation, the *accabaduri* were shunned as a criminal class; and yet the law was not strong enough either to suppress them or to punish those who hired them to commit outrage and murder.

The funeral customs of these island mountaineers suggest a remote connection between the East and the West. They resemble in some respects the rites attributed to the ancient Egyptians and also to the Greeks. For instance, the idea that the manes of the murdered must be propitiated by the punishment of the murderer; likewise the sacrifice of the dead man's dog at his grave, to be deposited at his feet in death, and the burial of the martial equipment of the deceased along with the body.

The hypothesis of a racial tie between the people of Sardinia and the Irish and Scottish Celts, at some period in the prehistoric past, is greatly strengthened by the existence of architectural remains of unknown origin. There are round towers in Sardinia, as there are in Ireland, and they are of similar design, but of wider dimensions. In both cases the door and staircase in these edifices were placed at a good height from the ground, so as to place the occupants out of the reach of marauders. No reliable light whatever has been shed on the origin and practical purposes of these enigmatical structures, in either case; and it is highly probable that they may remain a mystery, as to these points, until the end of time.

In the evolution of Sardinian civilization from such a semi-savage condition it was, perhaps, fortunate for the people that their lot was cast on an island rather than on the Italian mainland. Over the whole of this the spirit of lawless violence stalked unchecked for several centuries, and the many conflicts between city and city and State and State produced an almost general spirit of cruelty and unnatural hate. No such rivalries existed in the island, so that once the supremacy of the law was restored the way was clear for the arts of peace and the pursuit of national progress.

As for the laws of Sardinia, they form a very interesting study in themselves. They were a heterogenous collection, the product of different epochs, changing conditions and discordant social elements. The present system was the outcome of a codification completed in 1828, founded on the best of the old laws of the Aragonese and the decrees of the Spanish Viceroys, as well as the enactments of a much older code called the *Carta de Logu*. About this charter—which deserves to be styled an earlier *Magna Charta*—there centres a peculiar interest. It is possibly unique, in the fact that it was drawn up and established as the law of Sardinia by a woman.

She was Eleanor, daughter of the last Judge of Arborea (the island was then divided into four provinces, over each of which was a ruler called a Judge), and she was married to Brancalcione Doria, one of that famous line of Genoese Doges and merchant princes. While her husband was fighting in the field against the Aragonese she administered the affairs of his territory and compiled laws for its equitable government. This task she carried out so completely as to deserve the highest encomiums of jurists and historians in all the succeeding centuries. The chronicler of Sardinia, Signor Manno, says of this code: "Whilst I was perusing these remains of an old civilization it was not without a feeling of national pride that I repeatedly met with this sentence: 'Let not the guilty escape for any sum or consideration whatsoever'—a sentence which, discarding all pecuniary composition, in cases of high misdeeds, raises the laws of Eleanor above those of most contemporary nations, where the wealthy could almost always evade judicial punishment, which thus fell upon the poor with double severity, and became in fact an act of injustice toward the latter." Eleanor of Sardinia was in fact a feminine Solon of the Middle Ages—the equal of Stephen Langton or Simon de Montfort. Taken as a whole, the code of the Lady Eleanor of Sardinia compares favorably not only for wisdom and justice, but for humanity, with the highest achievements in law making, either of the ancient era or the Christian period. Capital punishment was not decreed in it except for the highest crimes—viz., murder, forgery, counterfeit coining and rape. Conspiracy against the State, which in almost every other country was accounted as high treason, punishable with torture and death, was under this code punishable only by fine. It is remarked by Cavaliere Manno that the phraseology of the code is, unlike other legal or judicial compositions, free from ambiguity, redundancy or prolixity, and leaves but little room for legal quibble. Could it be that when Shakespeare was drawing the character of Portia, he had in his mind the case of this mediæval Minerva of Arborea?

Sardinia prospered under the sway of Savoy rulers, until the line gave out in the direct current. Then the subaltern branch of Carignan-Savoy succeeded—the line to which the renowned Prince Eugene belonged. Carlo Alberto Amadeo—usually called Charles Albert—was called to the throne on the death of Charles Felix, in 1831. Then began the new era of Sardinian trouble. The storm long brewing over Europe had its focus in Italy. There the spirit of revolution, which had been smouldering for many decades, under Austrian repression, since the overthrow of the Italian Republics, began to assume the fiercest and most formidable character. Charles Albert, never having dreamed of being called upon to assume the

crown himself, had been an active plotter against monarchy. It is believed that he was a member of the Carbonari, as Louis Napoleon was also said to have been. Whatever be the truth of that assertion, the fact is that he had become so involved in the revolutionary vortex before he ascended the throne that he was no longer master of his own actions, but was irresistibly whirled along with the seething current. War with Austria became inevitable, when he had once thrown in his lot with the Mazzinians; and though he won some minor successes in the field, he was destined to be the victim of his rash ambition. At Novara and Custoza his star went down in black defeat; and the unfortunate King soon found himself without any alternative but surrender to Austria or abdication. The latter course he elected to take, leaving his uneasy crown to his son, Victor Immanuel II., grandfather of the present King of Italy.

It is not pertinent to this retrospect to follow the thorny road of Italian politics since the demise of Sardinia and Piedmont as separate States. When the fortunes of both became identical with those of "United Italy" their period of growth terminated. Turin has declined since it ceased to be the capital of the kingdom, as Florence in its turn declined after it had been forsaken as Turin was, in the onward march of ambition. Sardinia is unprogressive and stagnant, having lost its position as a flourishing monarchy and relapsed into dull provincialism. Still it enjoys peace. Its isolated position protects it from the excitement and turmoil of the agitations which sporadically convulse society on the mainland. If the nation is happy that has no history, then Sardinia must be in a state of bliss. If Piedmont can be consoled for the loss of her dignity as a ducal State with a royal capital, by the bestowal of its title on a prince of the royal house, then all is well with Piedmont likewise.

But there is a deeper question. When the House of Savoy abandoned its ancient traditions and accepted the new theories of democracy, it committed itself to a programme which might seem to involve, logically, the suspension of a new sword of Damocles over its own head in case it ever made a false step, or one that might be construed into a movement against the new theories of democratic freedom. The tenure by which the weapon is held may be estimated by the remarks of Sismondi, the historian of the Italian Republics. He says in his concluding chapter: "The object of men united into society being that of securing to each other the protection of their persons, property and honor, and respect for their moral sentiments, any government which should wantonly sacrifice or expose the same, which should offend against justice, humanity or public decency, would be utterly deficient in its object, and ought to be considered as a tyranny, even if established by the

will or the caprice of the whole community." What follows from such a decree? The individual who has satisfied himself that he is superior in judgment to the collective wisdom of the whole community is face to face with what he believes to be a tyranny, and naturally ought to take action suitable to such an intolerable position. Such were the views held by the men with whom the new departure in the House of Savoy was taken, and they made no secret of them. It was dangerous company to travel with, as poor King Humbert found to his cost. Better for him had his grandfather decided to stand upon the ancient ways—better, probably, for all Italy, too.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE FRIARS' ESTATES IN THE PHILIPPINES.

A RELIGIOUS order, like any other corporation, must have the means of subsistence if it is to live and do its work. To deny it that right is simply to proscribe it from the face of the earth. The means may come either in the form of recompense for spiritual services rendered, given by way of fees and voluntary collections in the churches, as in the United States, or as a salary from the government, as was the case in the Philippines in Spanish times. Or the entire income may be derived from purely voluntary alms without any reference to services rendered, as witness the Franciscans, wherever they carry out their peculiar rule to the letter. The possession by religious bodies of large properties, either worked by themselves or by tenants, has been consecrated by the usage of the older orders of monks from the primitive times of St. Benedict. The obvious advantage of landed capital is its stability, its natural growth and the wealth it brings in its train by industry and economy, wealth which may be used in furthering great works of charity after supplying the modest wants of the members of the order. A familiar example of this was La Chartreuse, in France, where, in addition to the ordinary sources of revenue from the estate, the manufacture of the famous liquer brought in an annual fortune, all of which went in works of charity. It is a peculiarly noble idea for a corporation to secure the independence of wealth by patient industry and self-denial in order that its members may be able to render charitable services without being obliged to ask anything in return. That was the

position of the University of Santo Tomas in Manila, which, without any public endowment, gave gratuitously higher education to thousands of Filipinos, doing as estimable a work as could be conceived. Such, however, is the hatred of religious orders in modern times, inspired over a great part of the world by Latin Freemasonry, that no truce will be made with them on any terms, and they are grudged the possession of wealth, whatever beneficent objects or works of public utility they may apply it to.

Contempt and calumny dog the footsteps of religious at every turn. If they live on alms they are "beggarly friars" (Foreman)—nothing so low is conceivable. If they receive fees for spiritual ministrations they are making a trade of religion and practising extortion on the poor. If they get a salary from the government they are robbing the State, even when the State is merely making restitution for robberies committed on the Church; they are "salaried employés" and, in the Philippines, "spies of the Spanish Government." If by economy and honest labor, prolonged through centuries, they have acquired landed estates and dispose of wealth, the eye of envy is more widely opened than ever, and they are "living in the lap of luxury, eating up the land, living on the fat of the land," and prompted by cupidity the unworthy cry is raised of the necessity of confiscating their property and devoting it to the common needs of the State. So that whatever means they may adopt, they find it impossible to live and work without exciting the rancorous jealousy of their enemies, their fate being never to be regarded by the world in a spirit of justice and fair-dealing. It is a recognized principle that every man is entitled to a reward for his labor; an exception is made against them. It is also generally recognized as highly praiseworthy for a man to devote his wealth to philanthropic objects as he conceives them; his methods are discussed without adverse criticism; but in the case of religious orders the chorus of condemnation raised against their wealth drowns whatever faint praise may have been accorded them for the noble manner in which they have used it.

In the Philippines the bitter ordeal of misrepresentation through which the religious orders had to pass with regard to their estates may be said to be over. The question is now relegated to the limbo of history, and the writer who discusses it at the present time will be less suspected of partiality than before. The atmosphere, moreover, has been cleared in more ways than one by the sale of the estates to the American Insular Government. The actual payment of the money to the friars on the production of clear titles has put the quietus on the theory so generally advanced that the greater portion of the lands was acquired by fraudulent practices, and the

detailed accounts given lately by the papers of their real extent and value have completely stifled the exaggerations so freely indulged in by American correspondents. The fabulous wealth of the friars has proved to be as great a myth as the milliard of francs given out in the French Chamber as belonging to the religious in France before their late dissolution.

A common mistake made by non-Catholic writers is that of confounding these estates with the property of the Church. Quite lately one of the American newspapers in Manila has addressed an open letter to the Archbishop of that city advocating the seizure of the moneys paid over by the government to the friars, that they might be applied to the general wants of the Catholic Church in the Philippines. The writer in his ignorance may have been actuated by laudable motives, but, nevertheless, it is well for him to be told that such a course would be confiscation pure and simple, and that no instance can be cited from ecclesiastical history in which property was taken from a religious order and handed over to Church dignitaries for general ecclesiastical purposes. Ordinary human rights over property are not disregarded by the Catholic Church. The estates were by no means church property in its technical sense, though they were in the hands of ecclesiastics. They belonged to ecclesiastical corporations, which had a right to hold property independent of all other bodies. The real church property in the Philippines has been made up from donations and legacies, from taxes on the parish priests and the accretion of funds accruing to the parish churches from the usual marriage and burial fees, one-eighth of which had to be set apart as church funds. All these moneys were controlled by the Bishops. On the other hand, the estates of the friars had come into being in the first instance from the savings out of the salaries of individual members and the private income of communities, and had increased in value and extent generally owing to the intelligent and economic administration of the estates themselves, under the direction of the lay Brothers.

In the rules and constitutions of the Dominican order in the Philippines, published some years ago in three volumes, it is interesting to trace, through the ordinations of the successive provincial chapters, the economic administration pursued in the early times and the heroic spirit of self-abnegation exacted from the friars. The great problem that presented itself to that order as well as to the others was the support of the head house in Manila, where the young priests got a training and the old found a refuge after their labors in the ministry; where also the administration and support of the missions in China, Tonquin and Japan called for

enormous outlay. At the beginning the head houses had nothing to depend on but the alms of the Spaniards, which must have been generous enough, judging from the gratitude constantly expressed for them in the acts of successive chapters. Though the King of Spain paid their passage out, the Spanish colonial authorities did not think it worth their while to set apart a site in the city for their habitation. The only site of a convent in Manila given gratis was that of the Augustinians who came with the first conquistadores and were present at the founding of the city. The other religious bodies who came later on had to lodge successively in one another's convents, first the Franciscans with the Augustinians, and, later on, the Dominicans with the Franciscans till money enough had been gathered to buy a site and erect a temporary dwelling. The site of the present magnificent convent of Santo Domingo was bought from a Spaniard and consisted of marshy land, which before he had banked it off from the river had been covered by water at high tide. The Jesuits for a long time did not succeed in getting a site within the city at all and had to build outside. It is thus clear that though the conventual property in Manila occupies such a large portion of the ground in the walled city, it was not by lavish endowment from the government, as is generally supposed, but at the cost of much labor and many hardships by bodies of men who for nearly three centuries formed almost a third of the population of the Philippines, even when we include the common soldiers.

For several years after the friars had settled in the country landed estates were not thought of in connection with the head houses and the general administration. The early system pursued by the Spanish Government did not readily adapt itself to the possession of landed estates other than by the *encomenderos*. These were men who in return for services rendered or money spent in the conquest of the islands got the governorship of a certain number of native villages and had the right to the tribute collected from them. The right to the tribute was afterwards taken away, owing to the many abuses it caused, and tracts of unoccupied land were given in compensation by the government. It was these estates, possessing a real and indisputable title, that afterwards formed by far the larger portion of the friars' property, for in course of time their owners, finding a much easier and more lucrative occupation in the foreign commerce of Manila than in clearing their holdings and developing their agricultural resources, offered them for sale, and a large number thus fell into the hands of the friars by purchase.

Before the purchase of the estates which were to supply the general needs of the orders and the expenses of their head houses

in Manila the fathers scattered on the missions had to be heavily taxed for that purpose. For the needs of their order the Dominicans taxed themselves to the amount of sixteen per cent. on the missionaries in Cajayan, thirty per cent. on those in Panjasinan and fifty on those in Bataan and the parish of Binondo. The taxes must have been taken almost wholly from the miserable salaries then allowed by the government, for church fees were next to nothing, the fee for marriage, for instance, being only two reales (ten cents), one-half of which was to go to the sacristan and the other to the registrar. We learn from the ordinations and rules that the fathers were not allowed to purchase or keep any land except a small kitchen garden. They could not grow maize or rice or do any trading such as buying in wild bees' wax. They were allowed, however, to keep three cows for the supply of milk, a great boon indeed, for chocolate was forbidden as too great a luxury, coffee not to be had and wine was only for the use of the altar. In course of time it was thought desirable to relieve them of all taxation for general purposes except an occasional special call, but as the expenses of the order increased with the great development of the missions in China, Tonquin and Japan, and the opening up of new missions in the Philippines which had to be partially supported until they were strong enough to support themselves, some new resources had to be sought for. This was why the estates were bought by the Dominican Order, and the same reasons will hold good for the Augustinians and Recoletos.

We may here call attention to the fallacy of the theory that makes the estates to have grown up out of the resources of the parishes, as if the parish priests had utilized their spiritual position for the purpose of gathering wealth. The general custom was, on the contrary, that all the money coming to the priest by his salary and church fees was spent in the parish itself; in fact, the parish priests never showed much anxiety to contribute to the provincial when he came on his visitation. The parishes had no relation whatsoever with the estates. The famous Imus estate did not become a parish till 1795, and up till 1860 the whole province of Cavite, in which so much of the property of the friars was located, did not have more than one friar parish priest, all the parishes but one being under the ministry of native clergymen. Calamba also, the great estate of the Dominicans, was served by a native clergyman up to the year 1888, the period of the troubles there with the tenantry, when the anti-rent campaign was begun. It was a rare exception for a friar priest even to reside on the estates. If the friars had acted like the Protestant missionaries in Hawaii, whose sons within the space of one generation became large landowners

and controlled the trade of the islands, they could have had an estate in every parish they served in the archipelago and have gathered untold millions during the three last centuries. But though most of the agricultural development of the country—north, south, east and west—is principally due to them, they acquired the ownership of comparatively a small amount of land for their own use.

When we say for their own use we do not mean that their wealth was used exclusively by the head houses in Manila and the general administration in supplying their own necessities and carrying out their own educational system. It is true that the expenditure involved in supporting the colleges in Spain in which their students were educated, and in the upkeep of their churches and convents in Manila was enormous. How many Americans who enter the Manila churches on great feast days, when, amidst lavish illuminations and gorgeous decorations, they listen to exquisite music rendered by well-trained choirs, stop to consider where the money comes from that makes all this possible? Such a thing as a church collection is unheard of; entrance to the churches is free to all, poor and rich. The divine worship of God in all that splendor is possible only by great outlay on the part of the orders, though at the same time it must be acknowledged that abundant help is also given in Manila by pious Spaniards and mestizos and even sometimes by pure natives. I know that the expenses of one church in Manila amounted last year to \$12,000. Again, the higher education, collegiate and university, they imparted to 10,000 young Filipinos before the revolution had to be supported from the same funds, entirely as regards the university and partially in the colleges, as the students did not pay an adequate pension. The erection of spacious colleges within recent years in Lingayen, Tujuyarao, Dagupan and Ilo-Ilo has been also at the entire expense of the orders. The richest Filipino in the country would smile at the idea of his being expected to contribute in any way to endow collegiate education for his fellow-countrymen. Another striking fact, the reason for which the Americans may not have fathomed, is the strange absence of beggars, even in Manila. The Filipino never gives alms. A poor man would never think of asking his neighbor for assistance in his necessities. He would ask him for the loan either of money or food, and this would be charged up against him with heavy interest, which he would be expected to work off by labor. In fact, the friars, who have been slandered by wealthy Filipinos as having taken everything they could and given nothing in return to the poor, have been the only almsgivers in the country. The poor have no need to beg in Manila, as they can get steady and abundant alms in the convents. For instance, at the Augustin-

ian convent \$80 are distributed regularly every month and \$220 on one great feast in the year. They also give \$200 to orphans annually. All the other convents likewise distribute regular alms. The Augustinians out of their common funds have endowed many chaplaincies in the provinces to provide for the support of auxiliary priests not allowed for by the Spanish Government, and, moreover, the missions founded for the wild tribes of Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc and Benguet have told heavily on their resources. As to orphan asylums and industrial schools built and endowed out of their own funds without any assistance from the charity of the public or the government, witness Guadalupe, Mandaloya, Pasig and Malabon, now, alas! in ruins, having been plundered and burned by the revolutionists, and their unfortunate inmates thrown on the world. The Franciscans, owing to their peculiar rule, could not possess estates themselves, but having got permission from Rome that the hospitals founded and served by them might possess them, the result of their charitable work may be seen in the hospitals of San Lazaro in Manila, San Lazaro in Palestina, Nueva Caceres and others at Los Banos, Cavite and Cebu. During the terrible epidemic of the cholera in 1821 all the orders came forward and gave lavishly, the Dominicans in particular handing in a sum of \$10,000 to the Manila municipality for the relief of the poor, for which as a voluntary recompense they received nine niches in the Paco cemetery. We may here remark that at all times medicines were supplied gratis by the friars to the sick. To the Dominicans also is due the supply of the drinking water to the city of Manila, for which act of generosity they have a perpetual use of the water gratis. The present municipality, in wretched contrast to the spirit of former times, have just passed a law taxing for the water supply orphanages and other asylums of the poor which formerly received it without payment. The Recoletos spent a vast amount of money out of their funds in sending help to their missionaries in Mindaro, Paragua and the Calamianes to help them to build churches and convents, and in some of the southern islands also used the same funds to build forts mounted with cannon in order to protect the priests and their flocks from the incursions of the piratical Moros. Nearly all the roads, bridges and other public works in the country were made by the friar parish priests, and it is incredible what sums were sent to them from time to time by the heads of the orders to help them to open up the country by road and bridge-making, a work so sadly neglected by the Spanish Government. Fr. Juan Villaverde, a great road-builder in Nueva Viscaya, cost his order more than \$25,000. In peace and in war they gave help to the impecunious Spanish Government, who looked to them for help

in times of public disaster, epidemics, earthquakes, famines, and never showed much gratitude afterwards. The conclusion forced upon us is that it would be impossible to find in the world another body of men who have acquired wealth with greater moderation or used it with better judgment or more lavish generosity.

The Jesuits, the most powerful of all the religious bodies in early times in the Philippines, were the first to appreciate the advantages to be derived from owning and cultivating estates, and bought them in largely, being possessed at the time of their unjust and cruel expulsion from the colony in the eighteenth century of several times over the amount of property held by the orders of friars all taken together. The accruing wealth was principally used by them for the furtherance of higher education among the natives. Besides the University of San José in Manila, they had several colleges and seminaries for natives through the provinces and trained great numbers for the priesthood. Not only did they give a great impetus to agriculture, but they endeavored to develop an industrial movement and started manufactures of silk and cotton, which, however, owing to the natural indolence of the natives and the overwhelming competition from China, did not prove a success. All their property, after their expulsion from the colony in 1768, passed into the hands of the Crown and was looked after by royal commissioners, who during the thirty years they administered it allowed everything to fall into neglect, dams and irrigation canals being permitted to remain unrepaired. In a few years once highly cultivated land became like a wilderness. The cupidity of the King had given the colony a blow from which it took a long time to recover. The estates were sold one after the other in course of time and passed with all their improvements into the hands of native families and others, some of whom hold them to the present day.

The possessions of the Dominican Order before the revolution amounted to about 50,000 hectares. In the province of Cavite there were the estates of Naic and Santa Cruz, in La Layuna there was Calamba, Biñan and Santa Rosa, in Bataan there was Lomboy, Parti and Orion. Some of these estates had belonged to the order for more than two centuries. They were principally devoted to the cultivation of rice, for which they were naturally suited, extensive irrigation works having been put up at great cost by the friars. In La Laguna, however, a certain mount of sugar was raised. There was a good deal of timber on some of the land and cattle was raised in a few places. None of the land was farmed by the order, but was rented out to tenants on very easy terms, as we shall shortly see. All improvements were made by the friars. The estates were managed by lay Brothers of the order, who exercised

a general supervision and collected the rents. The rent was paid on rice lands either in rice or in money, as the tenant wished; on sugar lands it was always paid in money.

The property of the Augustinians amounted altogether to 60,000 hectares, but 20,000 of these, the amount in the valley of the Cagayan river, should be considered apart as belonging to a very special category. In 1880 Moriones, the Governor General, desiring to further the growth of tobacco in Cagayan, insisted on the orders taking large tracts of land in that valley, hoping that they would develop the natural riches of that part of the country. The land was desolate and unoccupied, and he looked to them as the best civilizing influence that could be brought to bear on it. It is a rich country, capable of supporting four millions of people, but has been always very sparsely populated and even now the whole valley, comprising Cagayan, Isabela and Nueva Viscaya, has not more than 170,000 inhabitants. The friars did not want these estates, and took them very reluctantly; the Franciscans refused them absolutely, as it would be against their rule to hold possession of them. The next Governor General, Primo de Rivera, wanted to take them back. The Dominicans and Recoletos gave up their estates willingly, but the Augustinians, who had spent considerable sums of money in clearing the land and bringing colonists to it from Ilocos, refused to give it up without compensation.

The rest of the property of the Augustinians was all bought from Spaniards, and some of the title deeds go back to the sixteenth century. Four estates were acquired in the seventeenth century, two in the eighteenth and two in the nineteenth. These deeds, given in evidence to the American Commissioners, dissipated the erroneous impression created by partisan writers that the friars got royal grants of land at the beginning of the conquest. The Augustinian lands were all situated in the provinces of Manila, Bulacan and Cavite, with the exception of 6,000 hectares in Cebu. Like the Dominican estates, they were all rented out to tenants after having been improved by irrigation and drainage.

The Recoleta friars possessed, roughly speaking, about 35,000 hectares, 23,000 of which was grazing land in the poorly populated island of Mindaro. The estate of Imus, in the province of Cavite, consisted of 11,000 hectares, the first parcel of which was bought in 1686. More than a million dollars were spent on this estate in improvements. They had also house property in Cavite, the title deeds of which were destroyed by the revolutionists at the time of the blockade of Manila by the Americans. The same system of administration was pursued on their estates as on the estates of the other orders.

Surprise may be felt by those ignorant of the circumstances of the country of the enormous extent of most of these estates. However, the principle once admitted that it is perfectly just and lawful for friars as well as any other men to own estates, it does not change the nature of the case whether they are large or small, or worked on a large or a small scale, and if the friars added to them from time to time, it was simply because rice lands, which they principally were, could be worked with greater efficiency and with greater benefit to themselves and their tenants on a large than a small scale.

No small proprietor, unless very well situated by the banks of a river, can irrigate with profit. If several attempt to irrigate near the same waters it is a constant source of disputes and litigation. If, on the other hand, a proprietor gets control of a whole countryside, dams the rivers up in the hills and digs tunnels and canals in every direction, conveying the fertilizing waters over square miles of land, he creates unknown possibilities in the way of production and paves the way for a dense population. Rice may be planted in the rainy season on land where no artificial irrigation is available. The result will be one annual crop, scanty and uncertain. When rice is planted on irrigated land the result will be three abundant crops in the year almost of a certainty, thus more than trebling the production. Almost all the irrigation works in the Philippines have been done by the friars, a few by individual Spaniards, none by the Spanish Government and none by Filipinos. In modern times some large dams in Pangasinan and elsewhere have been made by the parish priests for the general utility with the help of their parishioners. The acquisition of these lands did not throw out old proprietors. They had never been occupied by the Filipinos, and, as we have seen, were acquired by purchase from the Spanish proprietors when the latter wanted to get rid of them. They were not a very desirable investment at the time they were purchased, for the population, being small, it would be only at the cost of enormous improvements, including works of irrigation, that natives would be induced to leave their independent holdings and come and live as tenants, paying a trifling rent that would hardly cover the outlay incurred. Altogether, taking the value of the land and the continual expenses incurred in improvements, they did not bring in more than three or four per cent., a percentage which could easily have been obtained by the friars in solid foreign securities without any labor on their part. But the friars had no desire of abandoning the rôle they played of public benefactors nor relinquishing the great share they were taking in the development of the country by the careful and efficient management of their

estates. On these estates, as everywhere else, they did their best to overcome the natural inertia of the Filipino, and tried hard to make him advance in spite of himself. It is remarkable how utterly helpless to advance the native is when left to himself. Even when he has acquired riches he would never think of turning them into an industrial channel, and seems to know no other way of making money produce money than by letting it out at usury to his fellow-countrymen. Besides he is naturally a spendthrift, and can dissipate a fortune in a short time that has taken him a lifetime to acquire. So he allowed the friars to direct him, to make the crooked ways straight and the rough ways plain; to expend their energy in raising him out of his slothful ways and giving him the opportunity of making himself rich, and then, because in the course of centuries, owing to their prudence, economy and careful management, the friars themselves gathered riches, the ungrateful spendthrift and gambler now turns on them and accuses them of having "exploited the country." This expression was used by Aguinaldo in a letter addressed to General Otis, in which he made the whimsical complaint that the friars had "created vast agricultural colonies." As he referred principally to the province of Cavite, where his home was situated, the examination of a few historical data will confirm the fact that the friars did create colonies, though it seems a want of ordinary common sense to put it forward as the subject of complaint. When the Spaniards first came to the islands the whole population of Cavite consisted of two small villages, known as Bacoor and Old Cavite. The first well authenticated census, that of 1735, taken about fifty years after the Recoletos had acquired the great hacienda of Imus, which included the village of Bacoor, gives the whole population of the province at that time as less than 6,000, including all classes, Imus containing 682 and Bacoor 558 souls, respectively. The following tables, showing the wonderful increase in population, prove that the friars did not practise that kind of landlordism that depopulates a country, but must have, on the contrary, exercised a wonderfully attractive influence:

Population of Province of Cavite.		Population of the estate of Imus.	
1735	5,904	1735	1,240
1799	33,302	1799	6,382
1850	126,627	1850	28,150
1877	132,064	1896	31,703

Judging by the wonderful increase shown in these tables, there could not have been more than 200 people, or forty families, on the estate in 1686, when they bought it from the Spanish owners for \$21,500.

It may be thought that the natives crowded on to the friars' estates because they had no other place to go to, but the fact

that there is still a tract of country several miles in width between Cavite and Batangas largely unoccupied, yet well suited for the cultivation of wheat and fruits of various kinds as well as the rearing of cattle, shows that the natives felt it was more to their advantage to be under the friars, paying a small rent, than to be their own masters. Such has been the desire of the natives in recent times for friar land that outgoing tenants have been paid up to \$500 for the right to take up a farm. The Imus estate as well as those belonging to the Dominicans in the same province have transformed it completely, for, unlike Pangasinan and some other provinces, its low-lying lands are not naturally fertile.

As regards Imus specially, the irrigation and other works are of enormous magnitude, and it has taken more than two centuries of expense and labor to bring them to their present form. There are forty-five large dams for restraining the waters in the mountains, one known as the Presa del Molina having taken eleven years to construct at a cost of \$90,000. There are twenty-eight tunnels bored through the lower hills, thirty-eight large canals and forty-one smaller ones, spanned by nineteen stone bridges. The works altogether are calculated to have cost nearly a half a million dollars, and if they had to be made over again by government, the cost would certainly amount to three or four million dollars. But the friars themselves being the architects and engineers and labor being cheap and more efficient under their management, a work was accomplished which was absolutely beyond the powers of the Spanish Colonial Government, who can show nothing to compare to it. Praise is freely accorded to men in other states of life who accomplish such works. Why is it denied to the friars? In addition to the irrigation works the friars constructed several roads at their own cost through the estate, bringing every part in easy communication with the other and facilitating the transportation of agricultural produce.

The ears of the public have been assailed for a long time by the persistent accusations made against the friars that they were rack-renting landlords, accusations spread abroad by their enemies to induce the American authorities to confiscate their land. Now that the estates have been paid for, we have probably heard the last of the accusations, but still it is well to hinder as far as possible a false tradition from being formed. The plain unvarnished truth is that the friars were the best landlords in the world. Their tenants paid only a small rent, much smaller than that paid to the native proprietors, were well treated and looked after in every respect, and at the cost of a trifling amount of labor lived well and had abundance of food.

Father Zuñiga, a well-known author, who traveled through Luzon in the year 1800, in company with the admiral of the Spanish fleet, makes very interesting remarks concerning the friars' estates which he visited on his journey, and as his book was written a hundred years ago, long before controversy had blinded men's minds, his account will naturally be received as impartial. Regarding the reason of the extraordinary lowness of the rents, he says that the friars had at first found a difficulty in getting tenants on the estates, and only overcame it by offering the farms at a very low rent, hardly corresponding to the value of the products even at that time, and that when the price of things arose the tenants were not willing to pay anything more. A small rise had been made just before his time on account of the tithes imposed by the government. Tithes, either Church or King, had never been imposed on the natives, but only on the Spaniards. The friars had escaped so far on the plea that their estates were rented out to the natives and not worked by themselves. However, the government insisted on getting them, and as it was plain that the natives would rather abandon their farms than pay the tax, the friars compounded with the government for a fixed sum, which they paid themselves, compensating themselves by slightly raising the rent. The rent on rice lands then, as in recent times, was about one-tenth of the total produce, and the native produced abundant crops with very little labor to himself. Zuniga also remarks on the abject laziness of the natives. He says that the highly cultivated estates of the friars near Parig river would give the false impression that they were more industrious there than elsewhere, but the real reason was that each was content to cultivate a small plot and worked for the present without giving heed to the morrow.

Many of the natives in modern times, possessing a little more enterprise than the others, became rich, drove their carriages in Manila and were able to send their sons to Europe to be educated. The farms passed down from father to son for several generations, and as long as they paid the trifling rent agreed upon there was no such thing as an eviction, though no regular lease was granted after the first three years. If the crops did not come up to the usual standard, the rent was lowered in proportion. If a tenant took up uncleared land he paid no rent for three or four years; in fact, the general custom was to pay no rent for the first two years anywhere, and if he required capital for working the land, as was generally the case owing to the improvidence of the people, it was lent to him *without interest*, to be paid back as he was able. There was thus no quicker or surer way of getting rich than by becoming a tenant of the friars. Rizal's father, who came to the Dominicans

in Calamba a poor boatman, by getting capital from them free and land almost free, made a fortune in a few years. The great desire of the lay Brother managers was to promote the interests of the tenants without a thought of self. What had they to gain for themselves in this life? They worked for a higher and nobler end. They may be seen now, those men who handled large sums of money and presided over great engineering works—one an infirmarian and another a porter in their convents in Manila, just as pleased with their present position as with the former. "I have made many men rich in my day," said an old infirmarian lay Brother, whom I had known for months without being aware he had been manager of a large estate. "How was that?" said I. "By lending them money," he replied, and then he explained to me the system of furnishing capital to promising tenants without either security or interest, which enabled many a poor man to acquire an independent position in a few years.

In Imus for the site of a house extending to 180 square yards the tenant paid the annual rent of 32 cents. For mango trees, the fruit of which often brought \$30 a tree, 12 cents. For a clump of bamboo, a tree which is of such general utility in the Philippines, 6 cents, the tenant receiving also full rights to cut wood on the mountain. The land itself was classed into first, second and third quality, and the rent arranged accordingly was paid in rice, generally amounting to one-tenth of the total produce. The labor entailed on the tenant was very little. He had only to let the water in over his land, turn over the soft mud with the plough, plant the rice with the help of his neighbors, he helping them in turn, and his work was accomplished with the exception of letting the water in three or four times during the growth of the cereal. He was generally able to idle most of his time during the year. Out of two quinions of land, one devoted to rice and the other to sugar (a quinion being about 12 acres) a tenant could make about \$1,700 free of all expense, a sum which should certainly have enabled him to live well and put by something for the future. Very few, however, were of a saving disposition, and they generally found means of disposing of their money in fiestas, fine clothes, jewelry and the cockpit.

A great difficulty encountered by the managers was the tendency to sub-let, a practice absolutely forbidden in the agreements. The friars desired to deal directly with their tenants and were determined to keep down the extortionate practices of middlemen. The beneficial rule, however, might be eluded in two ways. A tenant might contract a debt with another man, a money lender, or perhaps as the result of gambling; his creditor would quietly take over the

land and work him as a slave on it without any one else being a wit the wiser. Or a tenant might sub-let secretly to another man, getting from him more than twice the ordinary rent and living at his ease, while the sub-tenant would represent himself as a paid laborer. This shows the competition there was for the friars' lands.

Zuniga, speaking of his own time, says that the tenants sold or pledged their land to rich people, or sub-let them at such a high figure that they were able to receive more without working than the friar proprietors. The sub-letting was prohibited, and the tenants could be evicted according to the rules, if found out, but it was easy to conceal the transaction. The estate of Biñan in Laguna was altogether in the hands of the rich, who by their infamous secret arrangements with poor people in their power worked it by their means and gave them hardly anything in return. These poor people, who were generally working off usurious debts, were known as *casamatianes*. He also remarks that the tenants used to ruin one another by lawsuits. In each town there were a few men who, being able to speak and write Spanish, used to get a living by stirring up litigation. One of these literati would tell a tenant that another man's land belonged to him, having been the property in far-off times of his grandfather, and would confuse the poor man by a supposed intimate knowledge of the past transactions of his ancestors. Sometimes the same gentleman would go to the opposite party and make his case up for him, for a consideration, of course. A long and fruitless lawsuit would often end by the land coming into the possession of some rich Chinese half-breed of Manila who had lent money to both parties to enable them to go to law. Our author remarks that if a stop were not put to such proceedings most of the land in the country would get into the hands of these Chinese half-breeds. This seems to have been the case as regards Cavite, where the half-breed Chinese increased immensely during the last half century and furnished most of the leaders to the revolution.

The amusing account of the pettifogging lawyers of those days brings to our mind the rigmarole accounts and old woman fables sent into the Taft Commission by Felipe Calderon, the Manila lawyer, and published in the report. No claim on land is too extravagant for a Filipino, who having no sense of honor, goes on the principle that he will be none the poorer for making an application for what is not his own. The firm of McLeod & Co. about thirty years ago bought a piece of land in the city of Cebu from the Augustinians, for which the latter had a royal charter dated from the seventeenth century, yet natives have been lately troubling the firm with their pretended claims on it.

On estates owned by natives the tenants not only have had all along to pay a far higher rent, but they were kept entirely in the power of their masters by loans lent at exorbitant interest. The usual system pursued by native proprietors was that a tenant working the land with his own cattle would be allowed two-thirds of the produce; if he used the cattle of his master he was allowed only one-half. Being generally in an impecunious position, the tenant allowed his master to pay his taxes, marriage and burial fees and most of his outlay for feasts and gambling, all of which was put down in the books against him charged up with usurious interest. The consequence was that they were and are at the present moment in the condition of mere serfs. A good deal might be also said about the relations between the native proprietors and the daughters of the tenants. However, it is sufficient to remark that the richer and more powerful the Filipino is, so much the more vicious he becomes, and he allows nothing to stand in the way of his passions. During all the tirades made by the Filipinos, many of them land proprietors, before the Taft Commission, nothing came to light about the tyranny and malpractices usual on the estates belonging to the natives.

The campaign against the friars was inaugurated by Rizal in 1886 by the publication in Europe of his villainous book against them, "*Noli me tangere*." About the same time he and his associates thought it would be a good plan to give the campaign an agrarian character by representing his fellow-countrymen as poor, suffering tenants oppressed by rich and powerful friar landlords, who possessed most of the land of the country and were running it for their own profit. He thus thought to enlist the sympathies of Europe at the outset. He therefore wrote to his father, telling him not to pay any more rent, neither he nor the other tenants, but to send it all on to him, as he was arranging with the Spanish ministers in Madrid to have the friars ousted out of the country. The tenants on the Calamba estate, on which his father was the largest tenant, took him at his word, and for five years nothing could be got from them, though every means of gentle persuasion was used. At last the Dominicans had to bring the matter into the courts, and the case was appealed from court to court till the final decision was given in their favor by the Supreme Court in Madrid. Even then they refused in a body to go out in order to bring about the dramatic scene of being turned out by soldiers in the time of General Weyler. This, of course, was represented as an atrocious act of tyranny on the part of the Dominicans and Weyler, whose names were coupled together to make them all odious. Foreman speaks of the land in Calamba as having been rented on "tyrannical conditions to the

tenants." As he was on familiar terms with these tenants, a great friend of Rizal's father and knew the exact condition of things, this may be put down as one of the deliberate falsehoods with which his whole work is plentifully interspersed. General Younghusband, who is always rabid when he refers to the friars, writes: "In pursuance, therefore, of systematic perjury and rapacity, charges of various sorts were trumped up against Rizal's title deeds to his own estates, and these were bit by bit whittled away and bit by bit transferred to the interesting clerics who worked this infamous transaction."

Now what are the plain facts of the case? Rizal's father, a Chinese mestizo, that is, the son of a Filipino mother and a Chinese father, the latter probably unknown, came to the Dominicans in Calamba looking for land on which to settle. He was at that time a poor boatman. The Dominicans gave him a large tract of land, part of it uncleared, for which he had to pay no rent at all for two years, and received the capital to work it out of a fund of several thousand dollars kept by the friars as a perpetual fund to be lent without interest to deserving tenants. Rizal was a hard-working and energetic man and devoted himself to the cultivation of sugar, which though far more profitable a crop than rice, was neglected by the tenants in general owing to the extra labor and trouble involved. After several years of hard work he had 1,500 acres under sugar cultivation, with two large steam mills for crushing the cane erected at the cost of some thousands of dollars. He had also twenty acres under rice for the use of his family and numerous laborers and dependents. All he had to pay for his land was \$250 rent, though he was drawing a clear annual profit of \$25,000. In time he bought a large estate of his own, which he worked on the tyrannical Filipino plan already alluded to and sold clothes and other articles to his tenants, charging them up in his books at exorbitant rates. He also had the name of being very hard on the poor laborers employed on his sugar plantations, but tyranny practised by the rich Filipinos on their poorer brethren is so general as to pass unnoticed. In time also he secretly made himself master of some of the property of the other tenants, according to the usual custom. What professions of gratitude he made to the Dominican fathers whenever he came to Manila, sincere perhaps at the time, but—who knows the secrets of the human heart? This was the man whose son figured as the great opponent of the friars, who was determined to rid the country of their tyranny, who was spreading the most awful calumnies about them in Europe, when he was living like a prince on the rent money that rightly belonged to them. Only for the kindness and generosity shown by the friars to his father

he would probably have been all his life following his father's occupation as boatman.

When I visited Calamba some months ago I found that the Egasani family, who had been ringleaders with old Rizal in the anti-rent agitation, had been filling the heads of the American teachers with stories of oppression. According to their account, their father had had his rent raised on him to an exorbitant figure, and when he was not able to pay it the friars got him whipped and kidnapped away from his family. I need hardly remark that these are childish and calumnious fabrications. Nicasio Egasani, a common carter, came to the Dominicans many years ago and asked for land. He got a large amount of uncleared land free of rent for four years to give him time to clear it. At the same time he got capital lent to him free of interest to enable him to work it. In course of time his land amounted to 125 acres, for which he paid \$100 rent, which was at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total produce. Afterwards he was able to farm twice as much, which he got at the same rental as the former. The site of his house and garden was given for 50 cents annually. No wonder that he became a rich man, able to squander sacks of silver in playing monte. The anti-rent campaign was inaugurated by he and old Rizal going round to the other tenants and threatening to cut their throats if they paid rent any more to the friars. As to the whipping and kidnapping, the only foundation it rests on is that when the agitation was developing into a local rebellion General Weyler very justly exiled these two worthies for a year or two to one of the other islands.

Coming across a tenant of the neighboring estate of Santa Rosa, I asked him why the American Government had bought the friars' land. Not being sure of his interrogator, he replied that it was because the people hated the friars and did not want them. On my inquiring for what reason he said it was owing to their tyranny and rack renting. I then asked him what the rents amounted to, and when he gave me the figures I laughed and told him the rents were nothing compared to what people paid in other countries. Thereupon, in true Filipino style, he turned completely round, praised the friars as good landlords who charged very little and helped their tenants along, and he added that far more rent was paid on the estates of native proprietors. I then asked him how it was that they were against the friars. "Oh!" said he, "that is the work of silly people on the other side of the mountains" (meaning Manila). I need hardly say this man had no conception of who or what I was.

A tenant in Calamba got a good stone house and garden for \$3 a year, or a bamboo house with garden attached for 50 cents.

For timber cut on the estate, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a cubic foot. Land devoted to sugar was paid at the rate of \$15 for 5 hectares (about 14 acres) first quality, \$10 for same amount of land second quality and \$7.50 for third quality land. These are the "tyrannical conditions" (Foreman) on which the land was let in Calamba.

The following tables show the amount of land planted with sugar cane on the estate in 1896, as well as the total production of piculs (133 pounds), with value of the same and the amount of rent collected:

	Hectares	Value of sugar	Value of product	Rent
Calamba	5,072	301,880	\$452,820	\$8,768
Santa Rosa	2,707	164,676	247,014	5,176
Bifian	1,021	62,000	93,000	2,656
	<hr/> 8,800	<hr/> 528,556	<hr/> \$792,834	<hr/> \$16,600

Like the other orders, the Dominicans generally charged about ten per cent. of the total product for rice, but only one and a half per cent. for sugar, as there was much more labor and expense involved in this crop than in the former. If the product failed, the rent was abated in proportion. If a disease took away the cattle, the friars bought up others and replaced the losses of the tenants at cost price. A significant fact about the State of Calamba is that since the friars left the population has declined. Before they left it was eleven thousand; now it is only nine.

The Calamba episode aroused the cupidity both of Filipinos and of anti-clerical Spaniards who were anxious like many others to possess themselves of their neighbor's property when it was thought possible to do it by legal if not by lawful means. Many of the Spaniards in Manila, even of those who professed themselves friends of the friars, used to discuss in conversation the possibility of a general confiscation bringing some profit to themselves. In Spain the Filipino Junta worked up the same idea with the anti-clericals there, and articles appeared in the Spanish reviews written by Spaniards advocating confiscation on various grounds of utility and expediency. The banishment of the friars and confiscation of their estates was made a part of the programme of the *Liga Filipina* and the Katipunan Society, though the tenants of the estates showed no sign of discontent. The idea was not to relieve the tenants of the rent they paid, but to transfer the ownership to the government of the new Philippine republic they had in view. It was also put forward as a condition on the part of Fr. Aguinaldo and the other rebel leaders at the peace of Biac-na-bato, in 1897, according to themselves, but this is denied by the commissioner who treated with them on the part of the Spaniards.

It was confidently hoped by the revolutionists that the American

Government would, as a matter of course, banish the friars and confiscate their property, and the matter was urged on them persistently at the Sherman and Taft Commissions. The arguments used by their enemies were of the most flimsy character and were based, of course, on lying assertions. Señor Rosario, a doctor of law who had held a legal position under the Spanish Government, said that the friars claimed property which was not theirs; that all the world knew that the properties were gifts, and that they held them only as managers.

Señor Zerez y Burgos, a medical doctor, said that the friars had obtained their property by depredations on the towns, generally by threatening rich people about to die, warning them that they were likely to go to hell if they did not leave something to the Church, and also by encroaching upon other people's land, pushing their fences farther and farther out every year till they had absorbed all their neighbor's property. Señor Calderon, a lawyer, told the Commissioners that the friars had managed to get hold of the estates by putting up dams and charging the people for the use of the water, afterwards claiming the ownership of the land without any other title. Calderon showed in other ways a thorough knowledge of Philippine history, so that his evidence on this point must be put down as deliberate fabrication. Señor Melliza, a lawyer and judge under the Spanish Government and now Provincial Governor of Ilo-Ilo, also claimed that the property did not really belong to the friars, but had been given to them by the people, not for themselves, but for the welfare of the givers' souls for purposes of charity and education; that, moreover, the property had been legally seized by the revolutionists, as the friars were their enemies and had taken up arms against them. He finished by proposing the banishment of all Spaniards from the islands, friars and others, for fear they would create disturbances. José Albert, a medical doctor, whose life had been saved by the friars when arrested by the Spaniards for complicity in the revolution, urged their banishment. Angel Fabie said he did not care anything about their property, but if the government would determine to shoot the friars he would consent to it.

Is it not surprising that men, all of whom had got much of their higher education gratis at the University of Santo Tomas from the much-maligned friars, should not be ashamed to exhibit such base ingratitude to their benefactors before the world? Several of the most bitter opponents and calumniators of the friars had been charity boys, getting their food and clothing out of the estates that supported the university. Without the estates how would the friars have been able to keep open a university free to the three thousand Filipino students who frequented it before the revolution?

It was a woeful exhibition of duplicity and meanness, but fortunately it did not affect the object these men had in view. The American Government was not to be hoodwinked by their lying sophistries. The title deeds of the estates were examined and found to be perfectly valid, none others as clear in the whole country. As by the Treaty of Paris all private and ecclesiastical property was to be respected, there was only one of two courses to be pursued—either to let the friars return to the estates and help them to collect the rents, or else to buy out their interest. The government selected the latter course as more likely to hinder future complications. If the Spanish Government had remained in power for a few years longer it is probable that it would have sacrificed justice to expediency by confiscating the estates, thus buying off the opposition of the enemies of the friars. Spain, like all the other Latin countries, has had a disgraceful record in this respect. It is certainly better for friars to live in a country where, though Church and State are separate, their rights as ordinary citizens are respected, than to live under a government professedly Catholic, yet ruled by Freemasons and anti-clericals who utilize the union of Church and State to rob the former of its possessions whenever a chance is afforded.

It was thought that the friars would gladly welcome the four million dollars offered by the government for their lands, measured at 391,000 acres, more or less, together with houses, sugar mills, irrigating works and other improvements. The negotiations, however, came to a deadlock, as the friars valued their property at fourteen millions, a difference in valuation too immense to be easily bridged over. Moreover, it was found that the friars, foreseeing difficulties, had formed joint stock companies out of their possessions, retaining, however, for themselves the majority of the shares. The Recoletos as far back as 1894 had made a transfer of the estate of Imus to a company for the purpose, they said, of obtaining a regular income for the order and yet of being relieved of the burthen of collecting the rent and managing the property. Nevertheless the fact is that they retained full control and managed the property as formerly up to the time of the revolution.

The American Government insisted on the friars exercising their control in the sale of the lands in spite of the alleged rights of the companies. The matter dragged on without result till the end of 1903, when Governor Taft at last consented to raise his offer to \$7,239,784, which the friars accepted. The transfer papers were signed by him the very day before he resigned the Governorship of the islands and sailed for America. Bonds were immediately issued by the Insular Government and put on the market in the United States and, it appears, were fully subscribed to at once.

Within the last few weeks the Augustinians have been paid in full to the amount of \$2,076,000, and the other orders will also receive the money due to them as soon as they hand over their title deeds. Thus a matter of the highest importance has been amicably settled which would certainly have proved a bone of contention and disquietude for many years to come.

From conversations I had with some of the tenants on the estates and Filipinos in official positions, I found that they did not well understand the transaction. They could not conceive that the American Government would give such a large sum of money to the maligned friars. "Now that the estates are sold," said a notable anti-friar Filipino to me, "there will be no more difficulty about the friars; they were powerful because they were so rich." He evidently thought that the friars would not be paid. It must have caused general surprise and untold mortification to their mean opponents to see them getting the money due to them. Some are now urging that as the friars have been paid off, they are bound to leave the country, in accordance with a promise alleged to have been made by Leo XIII. to this effect. The Pope in reality made no such promise, and there is no immediate prospect of any more friars leaving the country; rather the contrary. Others are proposing that the money should be taken from them and applied to the general purposes of the Catholic Church in the islands, and that after being thus pauperized, with their title deeds and all rights to their former property gone, they should be hustled out. But this is only the savage and vindictive cry of a beaten bully.

It is a great boon to the friars that the payment of the money has been made so soon after the sale, for they were getting into financial difficulties owing to the long-continued non-payment of rent from the estates. Numbers of the tenants were quite willing to continue paying their rent to them if they had been let alone, as they often told them in Manila when they would visit them, but they were coerced all along by the anti-friar party and narrowly supervised. Most of them were charged three times over for the rent, first by the local municipality, who claimed it as their right, next by the Katipunan for revolutionary purposes, and sometimes also by the agents of Aglipay. Up to the present these unfortunate people have not gained by the revolution, and loud regrets have been heard from them regarding the change of masters. Owing also to the apathy and helplessness of the Filipinos when left to themselves, the magnificent irrigation works have been sadly falling into disrepair and the ground is not cultivated as carefully as formerly.

The idea of the government is to sell out the holdings to the actual tenants, the purchase money either to be paid outright or in small

yearly instalments, and this will probably take effect very shortly. The danger hanging over the tenants is that in the purchase of their holdings they may get into the usurious hands of their fellow-countrymen, who will fleece them mercilessly and sell them into bondage. The greater number of them may probably in time be reduced to the condition of peons or serfs on what will be legally their own farms. The absence, moreover, of a central authority and master mind will render the keeping of the dams and other irrigation works a matter of uncertainty and litigation, and altogether it is highly improbable that the tenants will find their new position as landowners an improvement on the old times when they were under the paternal rule of the friars.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Dundalk, Ireland.

CHATEAUBRIAND.

II.

CHATEAUBRIAND on his arrival at Havre had to write to his mother for money with which to pay for his passage.

She sent it at once. She was at Saint Malo with her brother de Bédée, and his family and Lucile. Chateaubriand went there to consult with his uncle about his proposed emigration. Things were worse in France. The King's brothers had been proscribed, and the King never was spoken of now save as "Monsieur Veto" or "Monsieur Capet." The *sans-culottes* were enjoying the rare pastime of baiting royalty, and they were glutting themselves at it. The first question with the family circle at Saint Malo was to get more money for the impoverished René that he might join the Princes. "This conjuncture of circumstances decided the most serious step of my life; my family married me in order to procure me the means of going to get killed in support of a cause which I did not love," declares Chateaubriand with disdainful calm.

The happy young lady selected was Mlle. Buisson de Lavigne, granddaughter of a Knight of St. Louis living in retirement at Saint Malo. She was seventeen, "white, slender, delicate and very pretty; she wore her beautiful fair hair, which curled naturally, hanging low, like a child's. Her fortune was valued at four or five hundred thousand francs." Lucile, who was a friend of the girl, arranged the marriage which was to make her brother independent.

"Have your way," said I. "In me the public man is inflexible; the private man is at the mercy of whosoever wishes to seize hold of him, and to save myself an hour's wrangling I would become a slave for a century."

The girl's uncle, M. de Vauvert, "a great democrat," was the one note of opposition. He objected to his niece marrying an aristocrat. Chateaubriand's mother insisted that the religious marriage should be performed by a "non-juror" priest, which necessitated secrecy. The uncle found it out and let loose the law on the young couple. The law plucked the girl bride from her very indifferent husband and put her into a convent. Lucile at once constituted herself her companion there till she was released and restored to her spouse. Chateaubriand, whose simplicity and candor at times smack of brutality or coarseness, sums the case up thus: "There was no rape, breach of the laws, adventure nor love in the whole matter; the wedding had only the bad side of a novel: truth."

After this pettish explosion he does justice (?) to his wife. "It was a new acquaintance that I had to make, and it brought me all I could wish. I doubt whether a finer intelligence than my wife's has ever existed. Mme. de Chateaubriand has an original and cultivated mind, writes most cleverly, tells a story to perfection and admires me without ever having read two lines of my works; she would dread to find in them ideas that differ from hers or to discover that people are not sufficiently enthusiastic over my merit. . . . Often separated from me, disliking literature, to her the pride of bearing my name makes no amends. What happiness has she tasted in reward for her consistent affection? She has shared my adversities; she has been plunged into the prisons of the Terror, the persecutions of the Empire, the disgraces of the Restoration; she has not known the joys of maternity to counterbalance her sufferings. Can I compare an occasional impatience which she has shown me with the cares which I have caused her? Can I set my good qualities, such as they are, against her virtues, which support the poor, which have established the *Infirmerie de Marie Thérèse* in the face of all obstacles? What are my labors beside the works of that Christian woman? When the two of us appear before God it is I who shall be condemned."

To which just summary of this *mariage de convenance* even the reader whom Chateaubriand charms into a sympathetic partisan must needs nod assent. Yet when this good woman died, only a year before her husband, he was so stricken by her decease that he pressed his hand upon his heart and exclaimed: "I have this moment felt life struck and withered at its source; it is now but a

question of a few months." This was probably sincere. It had been his earnest prayer that he might die before Madame Récamier, in order to be spared the aching void her passing would create for him. It should be borne in mind that Chateaubriand is writing of the marriage he contracted when he was twenty-four, thirty years later.

René and his wife, with Julie and Lucile, went to Paris. The King's flight in 1791 had caused the Revolution to take an immense step forward. When Louis XVI. was dragged back to Paris the National Assembly declared that it would henceforth make laws without any authorization of "Monsieur Veto." These were the days in which Danton, Marat, Camille Demoulin, Fabre d'Églantine and Robespierre, "those lovers of death," were gorging themselves upon blood. Chateaubriand says: "At this distance from their appearance, after descending into the infernal regions of my youth, I retain a confused recollection of the shades which I saw wander by the banks of the Cocytus." Small wonder. History then was an ensanguined blur of swift tragedies and changes.

After all, it soon appeared that Mme. de Chateaubriand's fortune was "tied up" so that borrowing became necessary. Chateaubriand secured a loan of 10,000 francs on his wife's securities. He was taking them home when he met an old messmate of the Navarre Regiment, Comte Achard, a great gambler, who invited him to his rooms. He lost all but fifteen hundred francs, and left that in the coach in which he drove home! After much search he found it again. "Failing that small sum I should not have emigrated; what should I have become?"

Finally, René and his brother and the latter's valet fly from Paris together to join the Princes committed to the Emigration. The most serious result of this movement was through the valet. He was a night-walker, escaped in a sonambulistic state, was captured and by his depositions served to prove the emigration of the others, with the ultimate result that Chateaubriand's brother and sister-in-law were sent to the scaffold. Become a soldier, Chateaubriand was wounded at Thionville, fell ill with dysentery and confluent small-pox seized him. He was honorably discharged and started with the aid of a crutch for Ostend, intending to go to Jersey, which he reached to pass four months between life and death at his Uncle de Bedée's at Saint Héliér. There is a certain pathos in his casual (?) statement that "the windows of my room came down to the level of the floor and I was able to see the sea from my bed." His nature had affinity with the sea, not sharing Jean Jacque's passion for mountains.

When he got well he decided to follow the example of M. de

Bedée's son and go to England to make his living. He felt touched at bidding farewell to this genial uncle. He was never to see again either him or his mother, or his sister Julie, or his brother. The packet on which he sailed for Southampton was crowded with emigrants, and he made the acquaintance of a Breton, François Hingant, who was to furnish Chateaubriand with much of the material for the "Genius of Christianity," while sharing hardships with him in London. His was a face which often rose to his memory in after years by reason of this association with his birth as an author and the most poverty-streaked stage of his career. On this ship he discovered Gesril playing chess in the captain's room. It was the last time he saw this domineering playmate of his Saint Malo boyhood. The bullying boy developed into a hero. He was shot with his companions at Quiberon, two years after this meeting, August 27, 1795, after a splendid exhibition of chivalric honor. As a lad of fourteen he fought in the American War of Independence. It was a not unnatural development of that kind of a boy in that kind of times.

With Chateaubriand's residence in London begins his literary career. He was shattered in health. The doctors said he might "last a few months (!)" and he was achingly poor. His cousin de Bedée sheltered him in a garret in Holborn. He conceived the idea of writing a work on the comparative Revolutions as one of timely interest. He had studied the latest and worst at close enough range. Peltier, a Breton emigrant, assisted the struggling *émigré* by getting him translations from Latin and English works to do by day, while he devoted the nights to his essay. But he only became poorer. With his keen appreciation of the violent contrasts in his life, he remarks that while penning this account of that poverty-stricken period of his career before he had published a thing, he had twice interrupted it to give magnificent functions at the embassy; one, a dinner to the Duke of York, the King's brother; the other, an eight-thousand-dollar party to celebrate the anniversary of the King's entry into Paris, on the 8th of July. "I have profited by these lessons; life, without the ills that make it serious, is a child's bauble."

He certainly had troubles, at home as well as in London. The papers told him of the execution at the same hour on April 22, 1794, of his brother (who was his godfather as well) and his brother's wife; of her mother, Madame la Presidente de Rosanbo, and of her grandfather, Chateaubriand's encourager in his Polar ambitions, M. de Malesherbes, that sturdy defender of Louis XVI., who had preceded him to the guillotine by a year. Chateaubriand's mother had been flung into a cart in Brittany and carried to a grave in

Paris, while his wife and Lucile were awaiting sentence in dungeons at Rennes, charged with the crime of René's emigration! Surely a little bitterness, a pessimistic color in the essay on Revolution, on which he was engaged, may be forgiven him! His outlook on life from a little child had been one of vague sadness, which events in his subsequent existence deepened into melancholy. But with what poetic grace it is diffused throughout these *Mémoires* of a long and wonderfully diversified existence.

Chateaubriand's first and most idyllic love affair occurred during this London exile. He had romanced about the two Indian maidens in the Floridas. He now experienced for the first time real emotion of the heart. Charlotte Ives was the only child of an English clergyman. She was literary, studious "and sang as Madame Pasta sings to-day." This sweet girl fell in love with the poor but romantic French *émigré* of twenty-six, and the poetic Breton fully returned it. Charlotte ceased to sing and René was filled with dismay as the term of his visit at the Ives drew near and he had not the courage to speak out. Poor Mrs. Ives, seeing these young innocent creatures suffering in silence, learned their secret. She spoke to the young man, under a sort of compulsion, believing him dumb through diffidence or humility. She declared the willingness of Mr. Ives and herself to accept him as a son-in-law! He threw himself at her feet, covering her hands with kisses and tears. Then, as she made a movement to pull the bell-rope that would summon her husband and daughter—"Stop!" I cried. "I am a married man!" She fell back fainting.

"Since that time I have met with but one attachment sufficiently lofty to inspire me with the same confidence," Chateaubriand adds, in reference, unquestionably, to the touching friendship with Madame Récamier. In all of Chateaubriand's writing in these "*Mémoires*" the reader not only feels what is said, but more keenly how it is said and who it is that is saying it. Death was the only incident of his long career which left him without more sense of himself than of it, and his anticipations of that and of his memory surviving it run through the "*Mémoires*" as the illuminated work does through a Missal. But in this love for an artless English girl he is almost entirely preoccupied with the sweetness of the pure emotion quite apart from himself as modified by it. Nothing could better prove its intensity. It is also pleasant for the reader to recall that Madame de Chateaubriand, who at the time of this episode was in prison at Rennes, "never read two lines" of her husband's work!

Chateaubriand adds in regard to this sad virgin love of his heart, which was such a tragedy of sentiment, "that I became obsessed

by the mad ideas depicted in the mystery of René, which turned me into the most tormented being on earth."

M. de Fontanes, whom Chateaubriand met on his visit to Paris in 1789, had taken refuge in Lyons when the bad days began, returning to Paris after the 9 Thermider, only to be proscribed on the 18 Fructidor, when England became his refuge. There he met Chateaubriand again and was destined to have a great influence on his literary success. Chateaubriand says he was the last writer of the classic school in the elder line, and that his style of melancholy "fixes the date of his coming; it shows that he was born after Rousseau, while connected by taste with Fenelon. . . . If one thing in the world was likely to be antipathetic to de Fontanes, it was my manner of writing. With me began the so-called romantic school, a revolution in French literature; nevertheless, my friend instead of revolting against my barbarism, became enamored of it. I could see a great wonderment on his face when I read to him fragments of the "Natchez," "Atala" and "René;" he was unable to bring those productions within the scope of the common rules of criticism, but he felt he was entering into a new world. He gave to me excellent advice; I owe to him such excellence of style as I possess." The two became inseparable.

The "Essai sur les Révolutions" was published in London in 1797. Its publication was a turning point in Chateaubriand's life, according to himself, and made a stir among the Emigration, as it was opposed to their opinions. But now he had acquired a friend in Fontanes—"the first friend whom I had in my life"—who had become enamored of these romantic blossoms of his genius and who said to him: "Work, work, my dear friend, and become illustrious. You have it in your power; the future is in your hands." A man who devoted twelve or thirteen hours a day to writing, and who would copy and revise a thing a dozen times *was* a worker.

A still more important thing as concerned his writing, his life, his soul and his fame occurred shortly after Fontanes' departure from London. A letter from Julie, July 1, 1798, began thus: "Dear, we have just lost the best of mothers." The news plunged Chateaubriand into a passion of grief, due especially to the thought that he had been the cause of sorrow to that mother on her death-bed. "I flung copies of the 'Essay' into the fire with horror as the instrument of my crime; had it been possible for me to destroy the whole work I should have done so without hesitation. I did not recover from my distress until the thought occurred to me of expiating my first work by means of a religious work. That was the origin of the 'Genius of Christianity.' Julie had implored her brother to give up writing, and when he received her letter she

herself had died from the effects of her imprisonment. So there were two voices that plead to him from the grave. Julie, herself a charming writer of elegant verses, became *devote* before her death and her life is included in Abbé Caron's "Lives of the Just in the Higher Ranks of Society." As Lescure says: "Sorrow made Chateaubriand a Christian as wrath had made him a philosopher."

He began this most important of his works that very year, but completed it only in 1802. "I toiled with the ardor of a son building a mausoleum to his mother. I was devoured by a sort of fever during the whole time of writing. No one will ever know what it means to carry at the same time in one's brain, in one's blood and in one's soul 'Atala' and 'René,' and to combine with the painful child-birth of those fiery twins the labor of conception attending the other parts of the 'Genius of Christianity.' The memory of Charlotte penetrated and warmed all that, and to give me the finishing stroke the first longing for fame inflamed my exalted imagination."

An important change had taken place in France. Napoleon, become First Consul, was reducing chaos to order. To make friends of the distinguished body of Frenchmen who had been driven into exile he granted an amnesty to all of them with some exceptions. Many were returning. Fontanes urged Chateaubriand to come to Paris and finish the printing of the "*Génie du Christianisme*" there. But his dear old mother was gone; his fiery brother, his charming sister Julie. Lucile, to whom he had been united by such sympathy, was now Madame la Comtesse de Caud. Nothing in France spelt home. It was the breaking up of his little *émigré* circle in London that tipped the beam toward return. He concludes Part First of the "*Mémoires*" thus: "I stole into my country under the shelter of a foreign name; doubly hidden beneath the obscurity of the Swiss, La Sagne, and my own, I entered France with the century."

One little episode of the London exile deserves chronicling, recalled by the mention of Napoleon. Chateaubriand and Fontanes were on one of their exploring expeditions in London when a sudden storm drove them to shelter in the open door of a mean dwelling. Another had already sought the same refuge. "There we met the Duc de Bourbon. I saw for the first time, at this Chantilly, a prince who was not yet the last of the Condès." Did Chateaubriand recall that striking meeting of the three exiles when the news that Napoleon had executed this same young Duc d'Enghien induced in him one of his instantaneous changes of attitude and set him forever against the Corsican?

Fontanes took the exile to his own house on his arrival in Paris,

and then "took me to his friend, Joubert, where I found a temporary shelter." Through Joubert he was to be aided by the friendship of a woman, Madame de Beaumont, and to reap from her salon many benefits if not so much honor as he was later to garner from the more brilliant one of Madame Récamiér. In much Chateaubriand was fortunate, though the plaintive note of the rain-dove is heard so constantly throughout his "Mémoires." Destiny for the moment was on his side. He could have had no better literary guides than these two friends, Fontanes and Joubert, who were also his severest critics. To-day one asks: Who is Joubert? Who de Fontanes? Sainte Beuve has a charming, beautifully sympathetic article on Joubert. He says "he was in his lifetime as little of an author as was possible; his life was entirely in his thoughts." Saint Beuve adds that Chateaubriand had in Fontanes and Joubert "two critics especially fitted to warn or guide him: Fontanes wholly protecting him, restraining him, at need defending him from all, covering him with his shield in the fight; Joubert stimulating and inspiring him, or murmuring gentle counsel. The best and most subtle criticism that exists on the early and great literary works of M. de Chateaubriand are contained in "The Letters and Thoughts of M. Joubert." M. Joubert said in a MS. found after his death: "I am like an Æolian harp which gives forth a few beautiful sounds and plays no tune." Mme. de Chastenay maintained that "he had the appearance of a soul which had met with a body by accident and put up with it as best he could."

Madame de Beaumont was also an aid, materially and morally, to Chateaubriand in his preparation of the "Génie du Christianisme" for publication. She was a delicate creature, the sole survivor of a family the Revolution had swept from the earth; "one of those pathetic beings who glide into life, leaving behind them a track of light," says Saint Beuve. "Her mind was quick, solid and elevated; her figure slender and aerial. It has been said of Madame de Beaumont that she loved merit as others loved beauty." It is not far to seek why Chateaubriand should have enlisted her deepest sympathy. Like herself, he was sorely bereft of near relatives by the guillotine of the Terror. When de Fontanes brought to her modest salon one spring evening in 1800 the unknown Breton exile she saw a slender man of thirty-two, of less than medium height, with well-set shoulders and a superb head, with the noble brow, curling black hair, eyes whose glances showed the depth as well as the color of the sea, and when he wished to please, with that smile of irresistible charm which Count Molé said was not to be found except in Chateaubriand and Bonaparte.

Chateaubriand got to work at once in the little *entre-sol* he had

taken in the Rue de Lille. "Not a soul knew of my 'Essai sur les Révolutions.'" While working on the "Génie du Christianisme" he had to do other work to keep the pot boiling, and wrote for the *Mercur de France*, which M. de Fontanes was editing. He had a pair of turtle doves (he was fond of pets and liked cats) which cooed so that he could not sleep one night. So he got up and wrote a most eloquent letter to Mme. de Staël for the *Mercur*. It concerned the views that lady had expressed in her recent work on literature. "This freak caused me suddenly to emerge from the shade; a few pages in a newspaper did what my two thick volumes on the Revolution had been unable to do. This first success seemed to foretell that which was to follow."

In correcting the proofs of "Atala," which like "René" was originally contained in the "Génie du Christianisme," he noticed some were missing. The fright he got over thinking some one had stolen his novel determined him to bring out "Atala" at once by itself. He did, and says: "The noise which I have made in this world dates from the publication of "Atala." My public career commenced." It was a striking novelty in literature of the period, both as to matter and treatment. It naturally excited much comment and discussion, especially among the academicians. Chateaubriand became the fashion, and was intoxicated with this first taste of fame. He received letters from impressionable young ladies, and their number increased after the publication of the "Genius of Christianity." As regards the latter, he says: "I am bound to say that, even though it were easy for me to take advantage of a passing illusion, my sincerity revolted against the idea of a voluptuousness that would have come to me by the chaste paths of religion; to be loved through the 'Génie du Christianisme,' loved for the *Extrême Onction*, loved for the *Fête des Morts*! I could never have been so shameful a Tartuffe."

"No! You never could, Chateaubriand," is the reader's hearty endorsement. With his intensity and his passion for revealing the very cells of his emotional feeling in these "Mémoires," had there been anything unworthy of an honorable man, nay, of a Christian, in his closest relations with women would it not have somehow appeared? It does not.

He thought he could nurse the sense of being a genius and a great writer in private. But de Fontanes introduced him to Napoleon's oldest sister, Eliza, Princess Bacciochi, and to his brother Lucien, a year or two later the Prince of Canino. He was also introduced at this time to Madame Récamier by Christian de Lamoignon. He adds here, rather strangely, "The curtain fell suddenly between her and me." Later, in Book XI. of the

"Mémoires," which is in its entirety a history and a panegyric of Madame Récamier, he says: "I cannot remember whether it was Christian de Lamoignon or the author of 'Corinne' who introduced me to Madame Récamier, her friend. On emerging from my woods and the obscurity of my life I was still quite timid; I scarce dared lift my eyes to a woman surrounded by adorers." One month later when he was calling on Madame de Staël, who had helped to secure his erasure from the list of the proscribed, Madame Récamier entered. Chateaubriand could hardly stammer a word to Madame de Staël, who was conversing (?) eloquently; he was staring so eloquently at that radiant vision which had floated in upon them in a white gown and was now enthroned on a blue sofa. "Madame Récamier went out and I did not see her again till twelve years later." Nothing weakened their friendship after that till his death.

The modest salon of Madame de Beaumont was a great contrast to the distinguished one of Madame Récamier, but it was more distinctively literary. "Since when has my Council elected to hold its sessions at Madame Récamier's?" asked Napoleon. In the one the young writer was unfolding the glowing blossoms of his genius, amid the encouragement of friends who were valuable critics. In the other he was to receive homage as its principal feature and most honored celebrity, and this was to continue till his death. What a honeyed sweetness there should have been in many of Chateaubriand's melancholy recollections!

"The Genius of Christianity" was published, and "although the success of my big book was as brilliant as that of my little 'Atala,' it was more widely contested. Madame de Staël, dipping into the uncut leaves of the volume and seeing the chapter entitled 'Virginity,' uttered a wail. 'Our poor Chateaubriand! That will fall to the ground,' and the Abbé de Boulogne had told the publisher: 'If you want to ruin yourself, print that.'" Later he wrote a splendid eulogy of the book. They neither of them realized the timeliness of its appearance. The First Consul was pursuing his work of reparation and reorganization. He had to contend with the irreligion of the day and he wished to restore religion as a powerful element in reconstituting society. "What I want," he said, "is the old Catholic religion, the only one which is embedded in everybody's heart, and from which it has never been torn. This religion alone can conciliate hearts in my favor; it alone can smooth away all obstacles."

He recognized Chateaubriand as a useful ally, and appreciated the timeliness of the "Génie du Christianisme" as due to his lucky star.

Easter Sunday, April 18, 1802, the Concordat was solemnly pub-

lished in every quarter of Paris with blare of trumpet and rattle of drum. This festivity of joy and peace received its religious consecration by a magnificent ceremony in Notre Dame, whose portals were thrown open for an official cortège for the first time in twelve years. The Archbishop of Paris met the First Consul at the door to conduct him to a dais prepared for him before the altar, with the Senate, the Legislative Corps and the Tribunes ranged on either hand. Cardinal Caprara, Legate of the Holy See, officiated at the Mass, and two orchestras supplied the music, under the bâtons of Cherubini and Mehul. That very day the *Mercur*e announced the "Génie du Christianisme," which appeared four days later, with the approval of Napoleon on the work, while its author in the preface discreetly conveyed his admiration for the ruler who had reopened the temples of the Christian faith and welcomed the Church back.

Writing in 1836, Chateaubriand says of this work so opportunely published thirty-four years before: "Now, supposing that my name leaves some trace behind it, I shall owe this to the 'Génie du Christianisme.' With no illusion as to the intrinsic value of the work, I admit that it possesses an accidental value; it came just at the right moment. For this reason it caused me to take my place in one of those historic periods which, mixing an individual with things, compel him to be remembered. If the influence of my work was not limited to the change which in the past forty years it has produced among the living generations; if it still served to resuscitate among late-comers a spark of the civilizing truths of the earth; if the slight symptom of life which one seems to perceive was there sustained in the generations to come, I should depart full of hope in the Divine mercy. O, reconciled Christian, do not forget me in thy prayers when I am gone; my faults, perhaps, will stop me outside those gates where my charity cried on thy behalf, 'Be ye lifted up, O eternal gates.'"

The October following the publication took Chateaubriand to Avignon, where they were selling pirated editions of his work. It also took him to Lyons, where he met the printer who, after M. Migneret, was the owner of the "Génie du Christianisme," Pierre Simon Ballanche, and they became life-long friends. The serene, beautiful character of this Christian man, Ballanche, entitles him to more admiration than do his notable books on Christian philosophy. He was one of the most ardent friends of Madame Récamier, one of the trinity which she especially cherished: Matthieu de Montmorency, Ballanche and Chateaubriand. Each of them was deeply religious. At least two of them deeply so.

Soon after the adoption of the Concordat Lucien Bonaparte gave

an entertainment in honor of the First Consul, to which Chateaubriand was invited "as having rallied the Christian forces and led them back to the charge." He had never seen Napoleon before except at a distance. "His smile," he says, "was beautiful and caressing; his eyes were admirable, owing especially to the manner in which they were placed beneath his forehead and framed in his eyebrows. There was as yet no charlatanism in his glance, nothing theatrical or affected. One single time, on the shore of the two worlds, I met the man of the last and the man of the new century: Washington and Napoleon. I conversed for a moment with each; both sent me back to solitude; the first through a kindly wish, the second through a crime."

Thanks to this interview, Napoleon appointed Chateaubriand first secretary to the French Embassy in Rome, to which he sent his mother's half-brother, Cardinal Fesch, as Minister. Chateaubriand refused the honor at first; then, through the entreaties of the Abbé Emery, of the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, accepted, "for the good of religion," although convinced he would be of little use. With superb self-appreciation he adds: "I am no good at all in the second rank."

What helped to persuade him was that his friend, Madame de Beaumont, now dying of lung trouble, was willing to try Italy for her health if he was to be there. They both went, and M. de Chateaubriand's clerical duties—"I had almost nothing to do. . . . I was happy when some funeral passed by for a change!"—did not prevent the most loyal devotion and ministrations to his dying friend, whose last sigh he received on the 4th of November, five months after his arrival in Rome. "One lamentable thought distracted me," he says when recounting this death bed. "I noticed that Madame de Beaumont had not until her last breath suspected the real attachment I bore for her." After she had received the last sacraments she talked for half an hour with her friend about his plans, urging him, above all, to live with Madame de Chateaubriand and M. Joubert. She was buried in the Church of San Luigi dei Francesi, and Chateaubriand erected a two thousand dollar marble monument to her there.

It was at Rome that he first conceived the plan of writing the memoirs of his life as a solace to his grief. He had been dissatisfied with his post, and Napoleon was not content with his fulfillment of its duties, thanks to Cardinal Fesch's representations. "Cardinal Fesch was no more of an accommodating superior than Chateaubriand was an easily-handled subordinate," says Sainte Beuve. Nevertheless, the Emperor created a place for him as Minister to the Valais, a Catholic republic in the Alps, and Mme. Bacciochi

sent him word through M. de Fontanes that "the first important Embassy available was reserved for him." Chateaubriand left for Paris January 21, 1804. Madame de Chateaubriand joined him there to accompany him to the Valais. His wife's complete loss of fortune made his reunion with her imperative, quite aside from Madame de Beaumont's wish.

On the 21st of March he went to the Tuileries to take leave of Napoleon, whom he had not seen since the reception at Lucien's. The change in the First Consul's appearance to something gloomy and terrible so repelled Chateaubriand that he avoided meeting him, and contenting himself with the conventional acquittal of his duty in merely presenting himself at the Tuileries, he hastened away. He remarked to friends at the Hotel de France on his return that "something strange must have happened to produce such a change in Napoleon." The something was the Duc d'Enghien and Talleyrand's attitude in the matter.

Two days later Chateaubriand rose early to visit a cypress tree in a garden at the corner of the Rue Plumet and the new Boulevard des Invalides. It had been planted by Madame de Beaumont as a child. After this sentimental adieu he was returning, when he heard cried on the streets the condemnation to death of "the man known as Louis Antoine Henri de Bourbon." It was almost like the tocsin of a new "Terror."

"This cry fell upon me like a thunderbolt; it changed my life as it changed Napoleon's. I returned home; I said to Mme. de Chateaubriand: 'The Duc d'Enghien has been shot.' I sat down at a table and began to write my resignation. Madame de Chateaubriand raised no objection. She was not blind to my danger. General Moreau and Georges Cadoudal were being prosecuted; the lion had tasted blood; this was not the moment to irritate him."

Chateaubriand alleged the serious ill health of his wife, just learned by him from her physicians, as his reason for resigning the Ministry to the Valais. But Napoleon understood and was furious. Through Mme. Bacciocchi's intercession no great evil consequences ensued, though Chateaubriand adds: "Till the day of his fall he held the sword suspended over my head. Sometimes he returned to me by a natural leaning; sometimes I was drawn to him by the admiration with which he inspired me, by the idea that I was assisting at a transformation of society, not at a mere change of dynasty; but antipathetic in so many respects, our respective natures gained the upper hand, and if he would have gladly had me shot, I should have felt no great compunction in killing him." For Chateaubriand, "the hero had changed himself into a murderer."

The whole following book deals with the case of the Duke d'Enghien, and was written at Chantilly. The wily Talleyrand's share in the miserable atrocity is strongly brought out. He begins with the assertion that "men dreaded a return to the days of Robespierre." Three years later allusions to this act of Napoleon's in an article in the *Mercure*, of which Chateaubriand was then the sole proprietor, caused the suppression of the paper and jeopardized Chateaubriand's liberty. "Does Chateaubriand think I am an idiot, that I don't understand him? I will have him cut down on the steps of the Tuileries," exclaimed Napoleon furiously. Yet Chateaubriand escaped arrest and was disposed to be more quiet for his wife's sake. But for the two or three years preceding this article his life was quiet and rather dull. Madame de Chateaubriand admired Bonaparte and cherished no illusions as to the Legitimacy. She would frequently predict to her husband what would happen to him if the Bourbons came back. She proposed travel, and they took some short journeys. They visited Mme. de Staël at Coppet, banished from Paris by Napoleon, and Chateaubriand envied her the luxurious exile she found so wearisome. They also visited the Grande Chartreuse and admired Le Sueur's frescoes.

At Villeneuve Chateaubriand had another sorrow. There is no doubt that his life was rich in them. He heard there of Lucile's death. Madame de Beaumont's passing had affected her mind. She had been living in a convent of the Dames Michel, brooding and writing extraordinary letters, grandiloquent and morbidly self-conscious, to her brother and to others. She was buried among the poor in an unknown grave! Chateaubriand did not even know where she died. "Lucile loved to hide herself; I have made her a solitude in my heart; she shall leave it only when I cease to live." He wrote to M. Chênédollé: "We have lost the most beautiful soul, the most exalted genius that ever existed." This is more than extravagant; it is irresponsible. However, one may allow for poignant brotherly affliction. Lucile's letters are conscious, almost pompous in their solemnity and wearisome in their egotistic humility and phrenetic affection. One may sympathize with Madame de Chateaubriand's sentiments in regard to her. "Still bruised by Lucile's imperious whims, Madame de Chateaubriand saw only a deliverance for the Christian who had gone to rest in the Lord. Let us be gentle if we would be regretted. The loftiness of genius and the higher qualities are mourned only by the angels." It must be confessed that there are times when the writer of these fascinating "Mémoires" loses the reader's sympathy for a moment by a bold touch of conceit, expressed with cheap floridity.

In 1806 Chateaubriand made his journey to the East, and on his return, in 1807, he bought the little property at the Vallée-aux-Loups for \$6,000, and spent as much more in embellishing it. Here he wrote "Les Martyrs, l'Itinéraire, le Dernier des Abencerrages" and began these "Mémoires." The Duke Mathieu de Montmorency bought it in 1816 for \$10,000, and it belongs still to his heir, M. le Duc de La Rochefoucauld-Doudeauville. It was offered for sale in 1889 for \$50,000, but did not find a purchaser. "The Vallée-aux-Loups is the only thing that I regret of all that I have lost; it is written that nothing shall remain to me," writes Chateaubriand in 1839, in Paris. "After the loss of my Valley I planted the *Infirmérie de Marie-Thérèse*, which also I have lately left."

On the death, on January 10, 1811, of Marie Joseph de Chénier, brother of the better known André de Chénier, whom Chateaubriand had helped to fame, Chateaubriand's friends wished him to succeed to his place in the Institute, as that body would be a protection to him. He was almost unanimously elected by the twenty-five members sitting on the 20th of February, 1811. He submitted the speech he was to deliver at his reception among the Academicians to the imperial censorship and received it back, heavily scored with Bonaparte's "blue pencil." Chateaubriand declared he would rather not be received than write another. The Minister of Police invited the recalcitrant author to try once more the air of Dieppe. There follow two rather quiet years. Then Chateaubriand came out with a political pamphlet which Louis XVIII. said was worth more than a hundred thousand men for the Restoration: "De Bonaparte et des Bourbons." It was published, as was the "Génie du Christianisme," most opportunely as far as concerned the cause Chateaubriand was interested in, viz: March 30, 1814. The Empire was crumbling after the superb Corsican had pocketed a good deal of Europe and had stuck crowns on the heads of most his family.

Chateaubriand's literary career is comprised between 1800-1813. His political career begins and Part Third of the "Mémoires," 1814-1830, sets forth that brilliant but less interesting period of his very full life. The last and concluding portion will be devoted to retirement and ruminations upon the past. Until he sinks into that modest tomb at the Grand Bè, Saint Malo, there will be something proud, sensitive and forceful about this Breton soul which had been swept along on such changing and violent currents of life. But this last decade of René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand, will be softened, illumined and guarded by the unwearying solicitude of the most beautiful woman in the world, who was also marvelously kind—Julie Récamier.

In the recapitulation at the end of Part Second, he writes, with

perfect truth in his judgment: "My life of poetry and erudition was really closed by the publication of my three great works, the 'Génie du Christianisme,' the 'Martyrs' and the 'Itinéraire.' My political writings began with the Restoration; with these writings also began my active political existence. Here, therefore, ends my literary career, properly so called. Not until this year, 1839, have I recalled the bygone times of 1800 to 1814. This literary career, as you have been free to convince yourselves, was no less disturbed than my career as a traveler and a soldier. There were also labors, encounters and blood in the arena; all was not muses and Castilian spring. My political career was even stormier." Chateaubriand writes this resumé of his career after he had entered on what Lescure calls "*la période crépusculaire de son existence*"—the twilight stage of his brilliantly colored life.

When the allies were fighting Napoleon Chateaubriand's high opinion of the genius of Bonaparte and the gallantry of French soldiers was such that he never dreamed of ultimate success for the invaders. He imagined that France would awaken to her danger from Napoleon's ambition and, by a movement from within, would enfranchise the French. If the political assemblies checked both these, that the people might know to whom to resort according to his mind, was set forth in his aggressive pamphlet, "De Bonaparte et des Bourbons." "The shelter seemed to me to lie in the authority, modified in accordance with the times, under which our ancestors had lived for eight centuries. When, in a storm, one finds nothing within reach but an old edifice, all in ruins though it be, one retires to it." He was not of those who believed that "the Bourbons never forgot anything and never learned anything." He prepared his brief both as a pamphlet and as a speech. When France arose he was ready to spring the latter on an assembly at the Hotel de Ville. Madame de Chateaubriand felt that the discovery of this pamphlet could only mean the scaffold for her husband. Chateaubriand used to take small pains to conceal the manuscript when he left the house, merely thrusting it under his pillow. As soon as he was gone his terrified wife hastened to secrete it on her person. Once after she had left the house she noticed that she had not the manuscript with her. She fainted in the Tuileries! She found it when she got home. "I never experienced such a moment of joy in my life," she says. "Certainly I can truthfully say that it would not have been so great had I seen myself released at the foot of the scaffold; for after all it was some one dearer to me than myself whom I saw released from it." Which simple but sincere avowal shows that the somewhat subordinate position Mme. de Chateaubriand occupies in her distinguished husband's "Mé-

moires" is no sign that she did not hold him in the highest esteem and affection.

"The allied army entered Paris on the 31st of March, 1814, ten days only after the anniversary of the death of the Duc d'Enghien, 21st of March, 1804. Was it worth Bonaparte's while to commit an action of such long remembrance for a reign which was to last so short a time?" asks Chateaubriand. Napoleon abdicated unconditionally on April 6. On the 20th he took leave of his guard at Fontainebleau. On the 4th of May he landed at Elba.

Louis XVIII. landed at Calais April 24, 1814, after twenty-three years of exile from his country and his throne, and resumed the French crown as his prerogative by birth. The Treaty of Paris between the allies and France was concluded on the 30th of May, 1814, and a general congress within two months at Vienna was determined on to settle final arrangements. Louis resumed things as a Bourbon. He "granted" the charter, dating his boon from the nineteenth year of his reign, considering Napoleon's as null and void. The sovereigns of Europe, who were at the very time in Paris, had all recognized Napoleon. Chateaubriand says: "That obsolete language and these pretensions of the ancient monarchies added nothing to the lawfulness of the right and were mere puerile anachronisms." Yet Louis XVIII. could become King of France only by his essential right to the crown, according to his way of thinking. Such right was inalienable and no matter what Napoleon had *seemed*, or what power he had wielded, he had never really been King of France. He, Louis, poor exile of Hartwell, had been its King all the while, howsoever his hands had been bound or his sway nullified. It was the logical point of view of Monarchy and of a Bourbon.

Louis XVIII. entered Paris May 3, 1814, the day before Napoleon disembarked at Elba. On the 19th of March, 1815, Louis XVIII. left Paris, and on the 20th Napoleon entered it, having returned from Elba. Chateaubriand comments on this move of Napoleon thus: "The boldness of the enterprise was unprecedented. From the political point of view this enterprise might be regarded as the irremissible crime and capital fault of Napoleon. He knew that the Princes, still assembled at the congress, that Europe, still under arms, would not suffer him to be reinstated; his judgment must have warned him that a success, if he obtained one, would be only for a day. He was offering up to his passion for reappearing on the scene the repose of a people which had lavished its blood and its treasures upon him. He was laying open to dismemberment the country from which he derived all that he had been in the past and all that he will be in the future. In this fantastic conception lay

a ferocious egotism and a terrible absence of gratitude and generosity towards France." This arraignment is no stronger, no clearer, than it is just.

Chateaubriand's voice in this moment of peril (?) was no undecided one. In a foot-note he says that M. de La Fayette in his "Memoirs," "confirms the singular conjunction of his opinion and mine on the occasion of Bonaparte's return," adding, "M. de La Fayette was a sincere lover of honor and liberty." Chateaubriand himself loved nothing more. He advocated the dispersion of the royal family while the King should remain in Paris. "Let us resist but three days and victory is ours. The King, defending himself in his palace, will arouse universal enthusiasm. Lastly, if he must die, let him die worthy of his rank; let Napoleon's last exploit be to cut an old man's throat. Louis XVIII. in sacrificing his life will win the only battle he will have fought; he will win it for the benefit of the freedom of the human race."

It is in portions like this of his "Mémoires" that the eloquence of Chateaubriand glows fiercely. Certainly in his scorn he has "winged words." How tersely and fierily he inveighs against the treachery of men at this moment. He scores Bonaparte; scorns Benjamin Constant; derides Marshal Soult; execrates Marshal Ney, and—"the King of France? Alas! He declared that at the age of 60 he could not better end his career than by dying in defense of his people . . . and fled to Ghent! At sight of this incapacity for truth in men's feelings, at the want of harmony between their words and their deeds, one feels seized with disgust for the human kind."

In the scamper that followed the King did not even notify of it those loyal henchmen "who, like myself," says Chateaubriand, "would have been shot within an hour after Napoleon's entry into Paris." At this juncture he met the Duc de Richelieu in the Champs-Élysées, and the Duke said: "They are deceiving us. I am keeping watch here, for I do not propose to await the Emperor at the Tuileries all by myself." Mme. de Chateaubriand kept watch on things, too, and hustled her husband into her carriage at four o'clock in the morning of March 20—that good man so wrathful that he neither knew nor cared where they were going.

Once again as a refugee Chateaubriand arrived at Brussels. No wonder he says, "I loathe the Brabant capital." He finds Louis XVIII. at Ghent and is made Minister of the Interior *ad interim*. The last words must have seemed eloquent. One consolation of these days was the Duchesse de Duras' friendship for him. *Apropos* of that Chateaubriand declared: "A man protects you through his worth, a woman through your worth; that is why, of those two empires, one is so hateful, the other so sweet."

The Bourbon King and his followers remained almost torpid in Ghent. One day Chateaubriand left that city at noon by the Brussels gate, to finish his walk (like most meditative beings he liked solitary strolls) on the highway. He read Cæsar's Commentaries as he slowly sauntered on, till a low rumbling caused him to look up at the sky. It was not rain. It was the magnificent death rattle of the artillery at the battle of Waterloo. He leaned against a poplar and his meditations were deeper and more gloomy. Each new burst of the cannon made his heart beat faster. A courier came riding up. To his feverish inquiry he received the assurance that Bonaparte was fighting, and that the Allies were supposed to have suffered defeat. There was another flurry at Ghent. Later reports declared that Bonaparte had lost the battle of Waterloo! Napoleon was the first to bring the news of it to Paris, where he reëntered the barriers on the night of the 21st. Again Napoleon abdicated; in favor of his son. Poor little King of Rome! "Napoleon le Grand et Napoleon le Petit."

When Louis XVIII. had returned to St. Denis and the cry was for Fouché, the Duc d'Otranto, as his Minister, Chateaubriand breaks forth: "I said my prayer at the entrance to the vault where I had seen Louis XVI. lowered; full of dread as to the future, I do not know that I ever felt my heart drowned in a more profound and more religious melancholy." Such a superlative in his case has indeed an appalling sound. Later he was waiting in an antechamber of the King's. "Suddenly a door opened; silently vice entered leaning on the arm of crime, M. de Talleyrand walking supported by M. Fouché; the infernal vision passed slowly before me, penetrated into the King's closet and vanished. Fouché was coming to swear fealty and homage to his lord; the trusty regicide on his knees laid the hands which caused the head to fall of Louis XVI. between the hands of the brother of the royal martyr; the apostate Bishop was surety for the oath." In its strength and daring and color Chateaubriand's language is at times more opulent and distinctive as a patriot than as a poet.

Before leaving Saint Denis Chateaubriand saw the King, who forced him to speak out what he thought of this move. "Sire, I obey your orders; pardon my loyalty. I think the monarchy is finished." He waited, trembling at his boldness, for a little, when the King said: "Well, M. de Chateaubriand, I am of your opinion."

"This conversation closes my history of the Hundred Days."

The following book concludes the third volume of the "*Mémoires*," and Chateaubriand devotes it to a study of Napoleon. He finds in the very treatment dealt out to him by the English an advantage for his glory. He says: "No man of universal fame

has had an end similar to Napoleon's. He was not, as after his first fall, proclaimed autocrat of a few quarries of iron and marble, the first to furnish him with a sword, the second with a statue; an eagle, he was given a rock on the point of which he remained in the sunlight till his death, in full view of the whole world." This is a specimen of the splendid illumination of Chateaubriand's rhetoric. It does not stand cool analysis, but its resonant verve is a delight to the artistic imagination.

It is interesting right here to see what Napoleon had to say about Chateaubriand on that island rock of St. Helena. "If in 1814 and 1815 the royal confidence had not been placed in men whose souls were enervated by circumstances too strong for them, or who, renegades to their country, saw safety and glory for their master's throne only in the yoke of the Holy Alliance; if the Duc de Richelieu, whose ambition it was to deliver his country from the presence of foreign bayonets; if Chateaubriand, who had just rendered such eminent services at Ghent, had had the direction of affairs, France would have issued powerful and dreaded from those two great national crises. Chateaubriand has been gifted by nature with the Promethean fire; his works witness it. His style is not that of Racine, it is that of the Prophet. If ever he arrives at the helm of State it is possible that Chateaubriand may go astray; so many others have found their ruin there! But what is certain is that all that is great and national must be fitting to his genius, and that he would have indignantly rejected the ignominious acts of the then administration."

"Such were my last relations with Bonaparte," adds Chateaubriand. "Why should I not admit that that opinion tickles my heart's proud weakness? Many little men to whom I have rendered great services have not judged me so favorably as the giant whose might I have dared to attack."

III.

During his political career as well as during the Hundred Days, a characterization of Chateaubriand made by M. de Lescure, his excellent biographer, is proven true. He saw things large and men small. *Il voyait les choses en grand et les hommes en petit.* The charm of these "Mémoires" is in their personal revelation of Chateaubriand as a man, in his thoughts, his acts and his relations with others. They are the close and throbbing portrayal of a sensitive, poetic, high-spirited soul, saturated with the emotions of a long and varied existence, melancholy, ironic, but to the end vital and self-centered. His deeds as a politician, as a statesman, as a partisan

(he was never a courtier) may be passed lightly over, though his integrity, loyalty and strength, despite his capacity for swift change of front, are constantly evidenced. Chateaubriand is consistent from beginning to end, despite apparent swift and radical changes of position.

He was made a peer of France August 17, 1815. "I received at my entrance the only honor which my colleagues ever did me during my fifteen years' residence in their midst; I was appointed one of the four secretaries for the session of 1816. Lord Byron met with no more favor when he appeared in the House of Lords, and he left it for good. I should have returned to my deserts." The Restoration had made thought quicker and more bold. "Appalled at the systems which men were embracing and at France's ignorance of the principles of constitutional government, I wrote and had printed the '*Monarchie selon la Charte.*'" Chateaubriand was hostile to the Duke Decazes, whom the King had made his Minister. Like Fouché, he had once been head of the police. The noblest of the Faubourg Saint Germain flocked to his entertainments. Chateaubriand, a Frenchman, says this: "The Frenchman may do what he pleases, he will never be anything but a courtier, no matter of whom, provided it be a power of the day." The assassination of the Duke de Berry, the Comte d'Artois' eldest son, increased the ill-will against Decazes and brought about his fall. The Duke de Berry was killed by Louvel, "a little man with a dirty and sorry face, such as one sees by the thousand on the Paris streets," February 13, 1820. "M. le Duc de Bordeaux saw the light on the 29th of September, 1820. The Papal Nuncio, in his congratulatory address in the name of the Diplomatic Body styled the infant "the child of Europe," and Lamartine apostrophized him in an ode as "the child of miracle." It is this nephew of Louis XVIII., better known to our generation as the Comte de Chambord, who was the last Bourbon of the elder branch to be heir to the French crown. Later Chateaubriand, almost in his grave, took his tottering way to London to pay homage to him whom he recognized as his King.

Before that same King's birth Chateaubriand was to suffer (?) on his account. Three good market women of Bordeaux had a cradle made for the coming infant and chose M. le Vicomte de Chateaubriand to present it—and themselves! to Mme. la Duchesse de Berry. He promptly asked for a ceremonial audience for the worthy souls. M. le Comte de Sèze thought this honor should be his. Chateaubriand was out with the Ministry. It became an affair of State and got into the papers. Whereupon the gallant market ladies wrote to Chateaubriand that they were willing to

state "in the newspapers," if he would permit such a measure, that they had selected him for their introducer to royalty and the reason why, and this would "silence all tongues." Chateaubriand wrote them a nice, tactful letter, which no doubt they had framed, advising a dignified silence in the matter, and adding that he and Mme. de Chateaubriand "eat your chestnuts every day and talk of you." History makes no report of any disaffection toward Chateaubriand on the part of the market women of Bordeaux.

Decazes was compensated for his fall by the Ambassadorship at London, and the Duc de Richelieu succeeded him in France. Chateaubriand, as we know, was to succeed Decazes at London two years later, but he was at low ebb in fortune now. On September 20, 1816, he was stricken from the list of Ministers of State and lost the pension attached to it. "The hand which had taken Fouché had struck me." He was obliged to sell his library and his dear Vallée-aux-Loups. He secured from Richelieu for De Villèle and his staunch friend, de Corbière, positions on the Council, and he was appointed Minister to Berlin. In the Berlin *Morgenblatt* a titled "newspaper woman of the time thus describes Chateaubriand at his first court fête, at which the future Empress of Russia and the Duchess of Cumberland were his partners in a polonaise: "M. de Chateaubriand is of a somewhat short yet slender stature. His oval countenance has an expression of reverence and melancholy. He has black hair and eyes; the latter glow with the fire of his mind, which is pronounced in his features."

Chateaubriand returned to Paris April 27, 1821, to assist at the baptism of M. le Duc de Bordeaux, which occurred at Notre Dame May 1, and in the distribution of honors on that occasion was restored to the list of Ministers again. Villèle and Corbière resigned July 27, 1821, on the question of the censorship, and Chateaubriand tendered his resignation as Minister to Berlin through loyalty. There was a new shuffle, and he went to take Décazes' place in London. "Mme. de Chateaubriand, fearing the sea, dared not cross the Channel and I set out alone."

"All the English are mad by nature or by fashion," Chateaubriand writes nonchalantly in this book of his Embassy in London, but he had a very gay time with these same lunatics. We hear of dinners, Almacks and *le beau monde*. "The day was thus distributed in London: At 6 o'clock in the morning one hastened to a party of pleasure, consisting of a breakfast in the country; one returned to lunch in London; one changed one's dress to walk in Bond street or Hyde Park; one dressed again to dine at half-past 7; one dressed again for the opera; at midnight one dressed once more for an evening party or rout. What a life of enchantments! I should a

hundred times have preferred the galleys." One smiles and reads on. He found London full of recollections of Bonaparte. "The people had passed from the vilification of 'Nick' to a stupid enthusiasm. His colossal bust by Canova decorated the Duke of Wellington's staircase."

Here is one of those touches which make his casual mention of persons entertaining. At an evening party at Lord Londonderry's, the English Premier, "I was presented by His Majesty to a severe-looking lady, seventy-three years old. She was dressed in crape, wore a black veil like a diadem on her white hair and resembled a Queen who had abdicated her throne. She greeted me in a solemn voice with three mangled sentences from the '*Génie du Christianisme*;' then she said to me, with no less solemnity: 'I am Mrs. Siddons.' If she had said to me, 'I am Lady Macbeth' I should have believed her."

The name and thought of Charlotte arise. He adds that she and a part of her family came to see him in France in 1823, when he was a Minister, and that "something may have been lacking in his voice," for she left a letter on parting which showed that she was hurt by his coldness. "If it were true that she had a genuine reason to complain I would fling into the fire all that I have told of my first sojourn across the sea," he writes. "Often the thought has come to me to go to solve my doubts; but could I return to England, I who am weak enough not to dare to visit the paternal rock on which I have marked out my tomb?" . . .

"God ordained differently, and I left for Verona; thence the change in my life, thence my ministry, the Spanish war, my triumph, my fall, soon followed by that of the monarchy."

This brief epitome may suffice. With what pride he speaks of the Congress of Verona and its consequences. "My Spanish war, the great political event of my life, was a gigantic undertaking." He meant to incorporate his history of it in his "*Mémoires*," but as it occupied four volumes he forebore to do so! According to the terms with the syndicate which had acquired the right of publishing his future works, this meant \$16,000 for him. But the protests of M. de la Ferronays (Ambassador to St. Petersburg) and M. Marcellus, who thought certain documents were published that should remain secret, he cut it down to two volumes, telling the gentlemen their scruples cost him \$8,000. It was still too long to embody in the "*Mémoires*." In this edition of the Putnams M. Edmond Biré, editor of the French edition, supplies an appendix on the Congress of Verona. The gap in the "*Mémoires*" is from October, 1822, to June, 1824. During that time the events occurred concisely enumerated above except the fall of the monarchy.

Yet it was then that the Spanish war took place, which was Chateaubriand's doing and which he rates as his proudest glory. His only recompense from it was disgrace. The Royal Family showed scant appreciation of his conduct of the affair, and the recompenses which followed it were the beginning of strained relations between Chateaubriand and the King, and M. de Villèle as well. Chateaubriand received decorations from the Kings of Prussia, Portugal, Sardinia, Spain and from the Czar Alexander, who alone among sovereigns was his personal friend. Later in his life he alludes to the casket containing these proud insignia as a box of worthless junk, which he would gladly dispose of for the most paltry consideration.

On June 6, 1824, he was curtly removed from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The loss of power was not more trying a blow than the affront which the dismissal was felt to be by him in its brusque ingratitude. He had certainly been a generous friend and loyal partisan of De Villèle, and the treatment accorded him by this man would have aroused the resentment of a far less chivalrous and sensitive soul than Chateaubriand's.

The *Journal des Débats* soon made clear that Chateaubriand in opposition was not to be despised and that he had its support. It had overthrown the Decazes ministry and that of Richelieu, and it also downed, as M. Bertin in his loyalty threatened to do, the Villèle ministry. M. de Villèle made himself so unpopular by his measures that in three years not parliamentary action, but a manifestation of the National Guard, prefaced his undoing.

Chateaubriand's vigorous aggressiveness in opposition was interrupted by the death of Louis XVIII., September 16, 1824, and he resumed it only after the coronation of Charles X., the King's brother, May 29, 1825. Chateaubriand's pamphlet "Le Roi est mort: vive le Roi" "performed for Charles X. what my pamphlet 'De Bonaparte et des Bourbons' had performed for Louis XVIII." After the King was crowned at Rheims Chateaubriand writes: "All my duties being fulfilled, I left Rheims and was able to say, like Joan of Arc, 'My mission is ended.'"

The National Guard had shouted "Down with Villèle" on the day of their review by Charles X., April 29, 1827. Villèle in his wrath induced the King to disband them. "A royal decree pronounced the disbanding, the most baleful blow struck at the monarchy before the last blow of the Days of July; if at that moment the National Guard had not been dissolved the barricades would not have gone forward," says Chateaubriand. Villèle was down and out by December 2, 1827. Chateaubriand was appointed successor to the Duc de Laval as Ambassador to Rome.

A memorandum on the political situation in France at that time (1828) which Chateaubriand sent to his friend, M. de la Ferronnays, will interest those who love politics and find pleasure in studying this side of Chateaubriand's ability. With deftly assumed humility he says that whoever reads it in his "Mémoires" "will skip it close-legged, and I should do as much in the reader's place." Then from the interest which some episode in them, after the manner of Homer or Virgil, would arouse, he draws attention to the difference between "the merit and glory of a great writer and a great politician." One smiles sympathetically at the epithet and at his characterizing his memorandum as "this little diplomatic masterpiece." It is by no means certain that he is playfully sarcastic in either qualification. Mr. Teixeira de Mattos foot-notes it thus: "I am inclined to echo a foot-note by M. Edmond Biré, who says: 'The readers, I hope, will not skip a line of this memorandum, a masterpiece of logic and patriotism and, which is no detriment, a masterpiece of style. Chateaubriand has written no pages that do him more honor.'"

There is no ambiguity here, and it is true as French readers go. Others may doubtless skip the memorandum. It is a political document and lacks the human interest which attaches to Chateaubriand's political deeds and their consequences. Everything that is personal in Chateaubriand, even his faults, is full of charm. He is somewhat of an *enfant gâté* by love, his own and others; but he is a fascinating "spoiled child."

From the letters to Mme. Récamier, written while he was at the Embassy in Rome, here is one extract to prove how endearingly and effectingly Chateaubriand could show his heart to his angelic friend. The epithet does not seem excessive. This extract cannot but help to a just appreciation of the elevated friendship existing between this sensitive and gifted man and this woman, world famous for her beauty, yet lovelier in soul than in body:

"When shall I cease to waste on the high roads the days that were given to me to make a better use of? I have spent with my eyes shut while I was rich; I thought the treasure inexhaustible. Now, when I see how it has diminished and how little time is left to me to lay at your feet, I feel a pain at my heart. But is there not a long existence after that on earth? A poor, humble Christian, I tremble before Michael Angelo's 'Last Judgment.' I know not where I shall go, but wherever you are not I shall be very unhappy. I have a hundred times acquainted you with my plans and my future. Ruins, health, the loss of all illusion, all say to me: 'Go away, retire, have done.' You wished me to mark my stay in Rome; it is done. Poussin's tomb will remain. It will bear this inscription:

F. A. de Ch. to Nicolas Poussin,
for the glory of Art and the honor of France.

"What more have I to do here now? Nothing, especially after subscribing your name for the sum of one hundred ducats to the monument of the man whom you say you love best 'after myself'—Tasso."

There is a love letter a Christian may roll under his tongue. It is to a woman "whose memory was as good as her heart." "The costly monument to Poussin was erected entirely at Chateaubriand's expense," says Bîré, "and was only completed three years after this letter. At that time he had renounced all titles and emoluments and was penniless. It took him four years from 1831 to clear himself of debt to the artist, who was not much richer than himself."

Pope Leo XII. died February 10, 1829, at 9 in the morning. On August 8 of the same year a new ministry was formed, and despite De Polignac's endeavor to retain his support, Chateaubriand resigned the Roman Embassy, from which he had hoped so much. The next great event was the Revolution of July and Louis-Philippe, the "Citizen King." It was the end of the Bourbons, and Chateaubriand retired. His public life is ended forever. He will still find much to occupy him in his loyalty to the scattered Bourbons, who had treated him so poorly: the Duchesse de Berry and her son, the Duc de Bordeaux, the Dauphin after the abdication of Charles X. and of her younger son, the Duc d'Angoulême. Louis-Philippe, smug "trimmer" on a throne, tried in vain to interest Chateaubriand.

"Philip is a policeman," he says with vitriolic placidity. "Europe can spit in his face; he wipes himself, gives thanks and shows his patent as a King. The degradation of the elected head constitutes his strength. We obey a power which we believe ourselves to have the right to insult; that is all the liberty we require. On our knees as a nation, we slap our master's face, reëstablishing privilege at his feet, equality on his cheek. . . . This reign of Louis-Philippe's, however long it last, will always be an anomaly. . . . It is this abolition (of royalty), and not any individual chastisement, that will become the expiation of the death of Louis XVI.; none will be admitted to gird on the diadem after that just man: as witness Napoleon the Great and Charles X. the Pious. To render the crown completely hateful, it will have been permitted to the son of the regicide to stretch himself for a moment, as a false King, in the blood-stained bed of the martyr." Enough for Louis-Philippe and the "*juste-milieu*!"

Whatever is lacking in Chateaubriand, it is not clearness and courage in stating his views or energy in living up to them. Nothing will ever shake his loyalty to his young King, "Henry V." Surely his life had its fill of Revolutions. Even on the day before his death the clamor of one will fall upon his ears and he "wishes to go and see it," but he must remain in bed to die.

He improved his leisure by preparing a complete edition of his works. But he was called forth to burn his last cartridges, as occasion offered, against the usurper, himself a Chonan of the Opposition to the end.

After two years of straitened means Chateaubriand received from Charles X. \$4,000 for the two years' salary as Peer which he had forfeited by declining anything from Louis-Philippe, and he was enabled to leave Paris and travel. Visits to other victims of misfortune were among his diversions. He went to Armand Carrel, in his prison, and assumed the care of his crossless grave. Also he visited l'Abbé de la Mennais, the "M. Fèli" of young Maurice de Guérin, and the two diminutive Saint Malo greatnesses—Chateaubriand's five feet four inches quite overtopped the other, who was a positive dwarf—met in the same prison of Sainte Pelagie, where Carrel had been thrown. Again, a more distinguished unfortunate claims a visit, the Comtesse de Saint Leu, once Queen of Holland, daughter of Josephine, wife of Louis Napoleon and mother of Napoleon III., when she was in the Chateau d'Arenenberg. From this he returns to hear of the imprisonment at Blaye of the mother of his "young King," and pours forth his plea for her in the "Mémorial on the Captivity of the Duchess of Berry."

In 1833 he received from the hands of the same Duchess a delicate mission, his last Embassy—to go to Charles X., her father-in-law, announce her marriage to Count Lucchesi-Palli and secure her against loss of her title, rank or maternal influence over her children. Poor Chateaubriand! "Bourbon through honor, Royalist by reason and conviction, Republican by taste and character."

He was also experiencing another sadness. He had created the romantic school and for long was its solitary star. But now Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Mme. George Sand and other literary lights were shining with great distinction in its firmament. He could well be concerned about his "Mémoires," which were to speak with his own voice—how eloquently!—to generations unborn and fix his fame with them. It is his work that will always live. The twilight of his existence had come, and life was henceforth to be divided between the Infirmerie Marie Thérèse and l'Abbaye-aux-Bois.

The latter, a convent of the Rue de Sévres in the Faubourg St. Germain, offered to Mme. Récamier after her reverses a small room

on the third floor. Could there be greater proof of the wonderful charm of this beautiful woman than was afforded by the throng of distinguished men and women whom she attracted there, who toiled up the hard stairway to the third floor like pilgrims to a shrine. In the days of her youth and wealth, with her superb establishment in the Rue de Mont-Blanc, to-day the Chaussée d'Autin, and her villa at Clichy, it was small wonder that her salon was the most brilliant one of the Empire, or that Fouché, at the instance of Napoleon, should have sought in vain to attach her to the court. Napoleon himself had been known to scowl at the radiant Juliette as he marked her beauty draw the attention of the people from his small but imperial self. Lucien, his brother, was desperately, fatuously in love with her. Prince Augustus of Prussia, nephew of Frederick the Great, besought her to divorce her husband and become his wife. M. Récamier was almost thirty years her senior, a father rather than husband, and she had married him when she was fifteen. Yet that she should have seriously considered taking this step in regard to a man who was more than indulgent stands as the nearest approach to a blemish which her character ever knew. That he met the proposal with such grave assent, together with his loss of fortune at this time, caused the tender-hearted woman to repent of any such purpose, and Prince Augustus was firmly dismissed. He carried her in his heart until death. Benjamin Constant was passionately devoted to her, and the letters of this prominent man of the times were so intense that his descendants have stoutly protested against their publication. Then there was the grave, clean-hearted, dog-like fidelity of Ballanche until his passing, with Madame Récamier weeping at his side. Mathieu de Montmorency, in name, character and ability of the highest nobility in France, said smilingly: "Three generations of the Montmorency family have passed under the yoke. We are all wounded, but we do not all die." Bernadotte, later King of Sweden, wrote her: "Amid the lustre which surrounds you and which you deserve by such manifold rights, deign sometimes to remember that the being most devoted to you in nature is Bernadotte." General Massèna on leaving for the army in Italy begged Mme. Récamier for a white ribbon from her gown. Later he wrote: "The charming ribbon given him by Mme. Récamier was worn by General Massèna in the battles and the blockade of Genoa; it never left the general and constantly promoted his victory." The signature of the "Iron Duke" is attached to this note: "I confess, madame, that I do not much regret that business will prevent me from calling on you after dinner, because every time I see you I leave you more impressed with your charms and less disposed to give my attention to

politics!!! I will call on you to-morrow on my return from the Abbé Sicard's, in case you should be in, and in spite of the effects which those dangerous visits produce on me. Your most faithful servant, Wellington."

Sainte Beuve, who touched on the last but not least brilliant period of the salon of the Abbaye-aux-Bois, was evidently as fascinated as the others by this innocent Circe, whose magic did not turn men into swine, but changed distinguished lovers into life-long friends. His essay on Mme. Récamier in the "*Causeries de Lundi*" proves this. He asks if Madame Récamier ever loved? "the chief and almost only question to be put in speaking of a woman. I boldly reply: *No.*" He then states that "the need of loving belonging to every tender spirit became with her an infinite need of being loved, and a fervent wish to repay those who loved her by kindness. She always remained pure, but always preserved the desire of conquest and the gentle skill of winning hearts—let us say the word, her coquetry; but (may orthodox doctors forgive the expression) it was a coquetry of the angels."

There is not room to speak of her women friends, since we are dealing only with the ideal relation which existed between a man of rare genius and sympathetic soul and a woman of entrancing loveliness, rather of soul than of body toward its last most consoling years, though Mme. Récamier preserved her physical charm almost to the end. Yet among those of her own sex who held her as a dear friend may be mentioned first Mme. de Staël, then Caroline Murat, Queen of Naples, Queen Hortense, Mme. Moreau and many others.

Chateaubriand describes that modest room in the Abbaye-aux-Bois, with its stone flooring and narrow, difficult stairway. "A dark corridor separated two small rooms. The bed room was furnished with a library, a harp, a piano, a portrait of Mme. de Staël and a view of Coppet by moonlight; pots of flowers adorned the window sills. When, quite breathless with clambering up three flights of stairs, I entered the cell at the fall of evening, I was enraptured. The outlook from the windows was over the garden of the Abbaye, in the green clumps of which the nuns moved to and fro and school girls ran hither and thither. The top of an acacia tree rose to the level of the window. Sharp-pointed steeples pierced the sky, and on the horizon appeared the hills of Sèvres. The expiring sun gilded the picture and entered through the open windows. Mme. Récamier sat at her piano; the Angelus tolled; the sound of the bell, which seemed 'to weep the dying day,' mingled with the last accents of the invocation of the night in Steibelt's 'Romeo and Juliet.' A few birds came to nestle in the raised outer blinds. I

joined the silence and solitude from afar, above the noise and tumult of a great city. God, by giving me those hours of peace, indemnified me for my hours of trouble. I foresaw the coming rest which my faith believes in and my hope invokes. I recovered my calm beside a woman who spread serenity around her. As I draw near my end it seems to me that all has been dear to me in Mme. Récamier, and that she was the hidden source of my affections."

Thus wrote Chateaubriand in Paris nine years before his death and twenty years after Mme. Récamier had retired to that little room in the Abbaye. Later the death of the Duchess of Montmirail, mother-in-law of the Duc de Doudeauville, enabled her to enjoy the large apartment on the first floor thus vacated. There she was better able to conciliate moderate means and the remarkable political, literary and social influence of the most frequented salon in Paris. Political up to 1828, her friends were to be found in high state positions and in the Embassies, although so far from seeking to sway or affect politics through them, mercy or pardon for culprits was all she ever sought to obtain.

From 1828 her salon became almost exclusively literary and academic, and Chateaubriand was King there. Mme. Récamier entered on her last phase of empire, that which she exercised over the old age of Renè, world-weary, dissatisfied with all things, even himself. "It was the one aim of her life," says Mme. Lenormand, the niece whom she had adopted, "to appease the irritability, soothe the susceptibilities and remove the annoyances of this noble, generous, but selfish nature, spoiled by excessive adulation." It should in justice be added that Chateaubriand's admirable devotion to Mme. Récamier was not merely to seek assuagement of his own ills. His homage to her, who, as M. de Monlosier remarked, could say, "Five hundred of my friends," was unremitting and intense.

Sainte Beuve (in reading his searching appreciation of the lady it does not argue a light, suspicious nature to believe that he fell as notably under the charm as did more distinguished victims) says: "During the last twenty years M. de Chateaubriand was the centre of her world, the great interest of her life, to which I will not say she sacrificed all the rest—she only sacrificed herself—but to which she subordinated everything. That he had his antipathies, aversions and even afflictions is sufficiently proved by the 'Memoirs Beyond the Tomb.' She tempered and corrected all that."

Readings from the "Mémoires" were a notable literary feature of the Abbaye. A collection of articles upon them based on these readings and with some extracts enabled Chateaubriand, in 1836, "obliged," he said, "to hypothecate his tomb in order to live," to sell his "Mémoires" for publication after his death. He obtained for

them a life pension of \$4,000 for himself, convertible to one of \$2,400 for his wife. After thus arranging for himself with posterity, he made provision for his last earthly lodging, "six feet of blessed earth" on the rock of Grand Bé, at Saint Malo.

Every day Chateaubriand wrote early in the morning to Mme. Récamier, just as, Ambassador at Rome, not a day passed without a letter to his absent friend. Every afternoon at 3 o'clock he went to see her. He said jokingly that "his regularity was such that people on the Rue de Sèvres set their watches as they saw him pass." This privileged honor was his alone. Rarely and with his permission some others were admitted. After dinner was for the rest, Mathieu de Montmorency arriving late, as his court services on Madame retained him at the Tuileries.

About the middle of 1846 Mme. Récamier was afflicted with a cataract, which gradually ruined her sight. About this time, too, an accident led to partial paralysis for René. Half-buried, then, before his complete descent into the tomb, his fiery and opinionated soul flamed strongly still. Mme. Mohl remarks on "his beautiful white silky hair blown about by a cold wintry wind as he watched the doctor coming from Mme. Récamier in the Abbaye." He would come in his carriage and be helped to his seat in the corner before any one arrived. There he sat listening, grave, possibly saturnine in his reserve, some ironic remark or keen question falling now and then from his lips. Chateaubriand had asked of God the grace of dying before his friend. She was the only close friend in his long life he was to predecease. Ballanche had prayed for the same favor. Both obtained it.

Mme. de Chateaubriand "fell softly asleep in the Lord" in February, 1847, as if to show the way to heaven to her husband. Balanche followed soon after by an equally edifying death. It was at his death bed that Mme. Récamier destroyed any hope for her beautiful eyes by her intense weeping.

After his wife's death Chateaubriand wished Mme. Récamier to consecrate their long friendship by becoming his spouse. She most gently, most tenderly declined the honor. Her motive was still that of the most thoughtful friendship. She believed that his daily call on her supplied an incident in his life which alone interrupted its eventless routine.

One year after Ballanche's death Chateaubriand died, July 4, 1848. The cannon of the June Revolution sent their baleful thunders into his death chamber, and recalled the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affre, shot a week before. He had seen the overthrow of Louis-Philippe. On the 2d of July he received the Viaticum, not only in full and perfect consciousness, but also with a profound sense of faith and

humility. The next day he dictated these lines to Geoffroy-Louis de Chateaubriand, his nephew: "I declare before God that I retract all that my writings may contain that is contrary to faith, morals and, generally, to the principles preservative of goodness." It was signed for him by his nephew.

When it was written he made them read it to him, then insisted on reading it with his own eyes. He resigned himself entirely to the act of dying and passed away the next morning at 8 o'clock to the rumbling of the cannon. There were at his bedside the Abbé Deguerry, rector of Saint Eustache, who was shot under the Commune as a hostage; his nephew, a Sister of Charity and Mme. Récamier. The last named, who survived him only a year, died of the cholera, a malady for which she had ever entertained the liveliest fear.

A funeral service was held in the Church of Foreign Missions, quite near Chateaubriand's house in the Rue du Bac. A solemn state funeral took place at Saint Malo on the 18th of July. The Mass was celebrated by the rector of Combourg and at the elevation the musicians played the air to which Chateaubriand had written his well-known lines:

Combien j'ai douce souvenance
Du joli lieu de ma naissance.
"I know no sweeter place on earth
Than the fair spot that gave me birth."

The procession of surpliced priests and the National Guards, with fluttering banners and glittering helmets, bore him then to the Grand Bé, the cannon thundering at intervals. M. Jean Jacques Ampère represented the French Academy. An innumerable crowd covered the ramparts and the reefs and rocks were black with figures. There was a squall as the sailors shouldered the coffin and bore it to the tomb. Then it suddenly calmed as they laid it into the grave. Peace had come to René in the spot which had seen his birth. Brittany and religion had given a magnificent burial to the neglected little boy who used to brood on Saint Malo's shore and who later wrote the "Genius of Christianity."

There he lies to-day, under a simple stone surmounted with a cross of granite and surrounded by an iron railing. No name, no inscription, no date. It was his own request. "The cross will tell that the man resting at its foot was a Christian; that will be enough for my memory."

His captivating record of his life, throbbing with the beauty, the melancholy, the fire, the loyalty of his strange soul, make the "Mémoires d' Outre Tombe" his greatest monument. "That will live forever," as Pierre Louÿs said to deMattos. Much has been said

and written by so many about Chateaubriand, about his merit and his influence. It is not necessary to make a summary of them. This autobiography contains him entire. "These 'Mémoires,' " says Sainte Beuve, "are, after all, his great work, that in which he reveals himself in all his egoistic nudity and also in his great talent as a writer."

This is why, save for occasional comment, which was little more than sharing a pleasing confidence with the reader, the writer of this article has been concerned to set him forth only as he presents himself. One cannot read these wonderful pages, through which a human life pours in such a brimming and richly colored sweep, without forming better acquaintance with Chateaubriand from himself than from a host of others who seek to appraise him. The personal temperament of the reader will have no little force in determining the regard awakened by them for Chateaubriand the man, whose voice breathes to him still from that lonely grave of the Grand Bé at Saint Malo. Characters the most varying held him in warm esteem in life, just as critics of the deepest insight and strongest judgment have widely differed in rating his artistic worth. Of this there is no question—that he was one of the most brilliant lights in the literary firmament of France in the nineteenth century, inaugurating the romantic school and influencing even to this day writers whose trend is along the way he blazed in a virgin woodland. He will never die in the memory of any refined soul who learns to know him in these glowing, superb "*Mémoires d' Outre Tombe*." Tolle, lege.

"No one remembers the speeches which we made round the table of Prince Metternich," Chateaubriand says on revisiting Verona in 1833, and calling the death roll of sovereigns who had participated in the Congress there in 1822, "but O! power of Genius, no traveler will ever hear the lark sing in the fields of Verona without recalling Shakespeare." There was solace in the thought and implied prophesy.

JOHN J. A'BECKET.

New York, N. Y.

MARTIN WALDSEEMÜLLER (ILACOMILUS).

D'Avezac, Marie Pascal, *Martin Hylacomylus Waldseemüller, ses ouvrages, et ses collaborateurs*, 8vo., Paris, 1867.

Fischer, Joseph, S. J., and Franz von Wieser; *The World-maps of Martin Waldseemüller (Ilacomilus) folio*, Imsbruck, 1903.

Ruge, Sophus, *Die Entwicklung der Kartographie von Amerika, 1500-1570* —Ergänzungsheft, No. 106, of *Petermann's Mittheilungen*, 4to, Gotha, 1892.

IN THE year 1490, two years before Columbus reached San Salvador, a young lad some ten or fifteen years old was entered as a student at the University of Freiburg in what is now the Grand Duchy of Baden, as Martin Waldseemüller,¹ son of a citizen of Freiburg.² This little lad, born and educated in a small German town, who as far as we know never saw the sea, and surely never crossed the ocean, was destined to give the name of America to the New World. The injustice done thereby to Christopher Columbus was wholly unintentional; Waldseemüller even attempted to correct his error; but man's actions, once they are consummated, are out of his control; and as Columbus found the western continent when he sought the Indies, so Waldseemüller when he sought to honor the discoverer of the New World robbed him of his well-merited honors.

Of Waldseemüller's life at Freiburg, of his family circumstances, of his career at the university we know very little. We can only conjecture that his purpose in studying there was to become a priest, for he died as canon of St. Dié, and that he did not waste his time, for he became a learned scholar. From the morning that we saw his father take him to the rector of the university we catch not even a glimpse of him until we find him fifteen years late a member of the *Gymnasium Vosagense* at St. Dié, in Lorraine. This *Gymnasium Vosagense* was a so-called collegiate chapter or community of canons who taught young men the branches now taught in a German gymnasium or in an old-fashioned American college. The *Gymnasium Vosagense* was the outgrowth of a monastery founded by St. Deodatus, Bishop of Nevers, in the seventh century under the Benedictine rule, as modified by the Irish Saint Columbanus. The wars and invasions of the tenth century caused the decay of the old monastery, which was turned into a collegiate chapter of canons, with a grand provost at their head. The grand provost, like his predecessors, the abbots, wore the mitre and car-

¹ Waldseemüller, not Waltzemüller, is the spelling uniformly employed by the Freiburg cartographer himself.

² This date is proved by the records of the University, as communicated by Rector Schreiber to Alexander von Humboldt.

ried the crosier. To protect the old monastery amid the disorders of the time the chapter fortified it. Gradually a village grew up around the stronghold (twelfth century) and received the name of the holy Bishop who had built the monastery, St. Deodatus, modernized into St. Dié.³

Such was the place where, in 1505, we find young Waldseemüller at the age of perhaps thirty or thirty-five. He was one of the savants attached to the gymnasium, of which the leading spirit was Walter Lud, some time secretary of Duke René II. of Lorraine, and a man interested in geography and science. Among his colleagues we find the Canon Jean Basin of Sendacour, the author of a book on rhetoric, reputed an elegant Latinist, and Mathias Ringmann, otherwise Philesius, a young scholar, who was credited with being somewhat of a Latin poet. He was even younger than Waldseemüller, being then twenty-three years of age, and was his closest friend.

About this time there was a marked revival of geography in central Europe. It centred wholly about the old geographer Ptolemy, who taught at Alexandria in Egypt about 150 A. D. Geography had been a lost science, it may be said, when about 1300 A. D. some of the Greeks exiled by the inroads of the Moslems brought a copy of Ptolemy to Italy. Thence it spread rapidly to Belgium, France and Germany. At Ulm, a town of Bavaria, two new editions of Ptolemy's work had been printed in the years 1582 and 1584. At Nuremberg John Müller, called Regiomontanus, was an authority on astronomy and geography, and Martin Behaim about the same time constructed the famous terrestrial globe, still in existence, which Columbus is said to have studied before sailing on his fateful first voyage. Geography and Ptolemy attracted the attention of southwestern German scholars in general. No wonder, therefore, that our friends of St. Dié also were seized by geographical enthusiasm and determined to publish a new edition of Ptolemy. For Lud was well versed in the science, as appears from his treatise on geography entitled "*Speculi Orbis Declaratio*," which he published at Strassburg in the year 1507.⁴ Ringmann appears to have been fond of literature and science in every form, while Waldseemüller was not only an authority on Ptolemy, but a practical designer of maps. He it was who was to prepare the maps for the new edition of Ptolemy. Ringmann's share of the work was the correction of the Latin text of the maps, *i. e.*, the determination of the proper Latin for the Greek names. Lud undertook to install a printing press at St. Dié and pay for the cost of the Ptolemy.

³ St. Dié had 10,000 inhabitants in 1867, and was an Episcopal See.

⁴ The printer was John Grüninger.

Behind these men stood the Duke of Lorraine, René II., the friend and patron of Walter Lud. Not that the Duke was a financial auxiliary, for Lud had pledged himself to provide the needed money. But René, owing to his influence, was able to procure for his *protégés* new information and new books as well as the coöperation of other men of learning.

Among the material thus procured by the Duke of Lorraine were some Portuguese marine maps exhibiting the progress of discovery on the eastern coast of South America and a manuscript copy of Vespucci's "Four Voyages" in French. Both came from Lisbon. Father Fischer, the learned Jesuit who discovered the famous Waldseemüller map, and Franz von Wieser have proved that the map placed by Duke René at the disposal of the geographer of St. Dié was the Canerio map now in the archives of the Service Hydrographique de la Marine at Paris. This map, they think, is based in part on information due to Amerigo Vespucci, and in this they agree with the German geographer Sophus Ruge.⁵ How the Duke of Lorraine became possessed of these precious documents we do not know. We do know, however, that in 1505 Mathias Ringmann published a translation of Vespucci's letter to Lorenzo di Pier Francesco dei Medici, the nephew of the great Lorenzo, and that this letter had been translated from Italian into Latin by Fra Giovanni Giocondo.⁶ The letter to dei Medici, howsoever it fell into Ringmann's hands,⁷ must have produced a profound impression on him and his friends, and it was probably at their request that Duke René wrote to Lisbon for further information. Vespucci was there at this very time, and he may well have furnished the information laid down in Canerio's map. As we know that the copy of Vespucci's "Four Voyages" was in French, it is not safe to connect it directly with the Florentine geographers.

At all events Waldseemüller and his friends were deeply impressed by the story of the new discoveries, as told in the letter to Lorenzo dei Medici and the "Four Voyages." This is clear from Waldseemüller's later proceedings. For while early in 1507 Lud still speaks of printing the Ptolemy, the geographers of St. Dié soon after seem to have put off indefinitely the publication of the projected edition

⁵ Cf. *Entwicklung der Kartographie von Amerika*, *Ergänzungsheft of Petermann's noutulung*, No. 106, p. 37.

⁶ Fra Giovanni Giocondo was a native of Verona. He was employed as an architect and engineer at Venice. In 1499 he came to Paris, where he was the architect employed by the city to build two bridges over the Seine, the New Bridge and the Notre Dame Bridge. It seems more than likely that he was a kinsman of Giuliano del Giocondo, son of Bartolomeo, who induced Amerigo to enter the Portuguese service in 1503.

⁷ In his dedication to his friend, Jacob Braun, Ringmann tells us that he came upon it by chance.

of Ptolemy for reasons we cannot now divine. We infer this from a passage in Walter Lud's treatise entitled "Explanation of the Mirror of the World," published by John Reinhart of Grüningen, usually called John Grüninger, a printer of Strassburg. It is found on leaflet iii. of the work, which consists of eight leaflets. We translate:

"We shall not deny that beyond Europe may be properly placed the map hastily prepared by us of the unknown country found both before and since the preparation of this Mirror of the World by the King of Portugal. On this country the reader may find fuller and more correct information in the Ptolemy edition by us and Martin Ilacomylus, a man most learned in matters of this kind, with many additions (which Ptolemy, with the help of Christ, we shall soon print). A description of these lands, in the French language, sent from Portugal to you, most illustrious King René, Jean Basin of Sendacour, a distinguished scholar, translated [into Latin] at my request, with his well-known elegance, and booksellers generally offer for sale an epigram of our friend Philesius Vosigena [Ringmann], printed in the pamphlet of Americus Vesputius, translated from the Italian into Latin by Jocundus of Verona, who holds the office of architect in Venice. This epigram I have subjoined."⁸

In fact the Ptolemy was not published till 1513. But Waldseemüller could not reconcile himself to postponing the publication of what he considered the greatest and most important improvement on Ptolemy's work, the outline of the new Spanish and Portuguese discoveries. He resolved to design a globe and a large planisphere, exhibiting an outline of the New World, as, following the example of Vespucci, he called the recently found countries. The globe, as he himself tells us, was on a modest scale, but to the map he gave larger proportions, indeed proportions so gigantic that they excite our admiration even to-day. Possibly this map was perhaps the first wall map ever published. It was certainly one of the first.

Up to this time, outside of the marine maps carried for practical purposes by navigators, cartography had been mainly occupied with repeated editions of Ptolemy, all of which contained a treatise explaining the construction of the maps, the symbols employed, the improvements and innovations made. Could Waldseemüller send out his world-map without a word of explanation? Assuredly not. Accordingly he prepared a little work, the title of which sets forth, at least in part, its nature. It is as follows: "*Cosmographiae Introductio cum quibusdam Geometriae ac Astronomiae principiis ad eam rem necessariis. Insuper quatuor Americi Vesputii navigationes.*" "Introduction to the World Map, with the principles of geometry

⁸ D'Arvezac, Martin Waldseemüller, p. 60.

and astronomy necessary for its understanding. Besides the Four Voyages of Americus Vesputius."

This treatise was ready for the printer in the spring of 1507. Meantime Walter Lud had installed at St. Dié a printing press. From the letters G. L., N. L. and M. I. found as a printer's mark on the last page of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* it is fair to infer that Martin Ilacomilus [Waldseemüller] was at the time of its publication associated with Walter Lud [G. L.] and his kinsman, Nicolas Lud [N. L.], in the printing business. On the seventh day before the Kalends of May, *i. e.*, on the 25th of April, 1507, the *Cosmographiae Introductio* was published at St. Dié and dedicated to the Emperor Maximilian I. by Martin Waldseemüller. The author speaks in the first person singular throughout the entire dedication, in which he recommends himself to the Emperor and declares that "under his ægis, so to say, as under the shield of Achilles, he should be safe from the intrigues of his rivals." After the appearance of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, in February, 1508, the Freiburg geographer left St. Dié on a visit to Germany.⁹ At Strassburg he wrote a letter to his friend Ringmann, now professor of cosmography at Basel, declaring that certain persons had sought to rob him of the credit due to him as the author of the map. Nowhere in his published writings does he mention the names of his rivals as he calls them in the dedication to Maximilian, but we have the means of solving the problem. The edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* issued on the 25th of April¹⁰ was followed by two other editions in the same year. The first of these editions must have been issued very soon after the original edition. Indeed, it is the original edition reprinted, with only four pages changed. The purpose of the change is plain. Every allusion to the authorship of Waldseemüller is effaced in the dedication as well as in

⁹ We translate the passages. "Martin Ilacomilus, of Freiburg, sends greeting to his friend Philesius (Ringmann)). When, during these carnival days, in order to console myself, I had to come to Germany from France, or rather from the town in the Vosges called St. Dié, where, as you know, principally under my guidance and through my exertions, although others falsely claim it for themselves, we have recently composed, designed and printed a picture of the world, both in the form of a globe, as also in the form of a map, which was circulated throughout the world, not without credit and glory to us. I . . ." This letter appears in the third Strassburg edition, published in 1508 by John Grüniger, of Prior Gregory Reisch's "Margarita Philosophica," a kind of primitive encyclopædia. For the third edition of Grüniger's Waldseemüller wrote an article extending over fourteen leaves, under the title "Architecturæ et Perspectivæ Rudimenta." The letter to Ringmann is its preface.—D'Avezac, Martin Waltzemüller, pp. 109-10.

¹⁰ Of this edition only a single copy remains. It was found early last century on an old book-stand in Paris, and purchased for one franc. After passing through the hands of M. Yemiz, it was sold to Mr. Griswold for 2,000 francs.

some verses printed on the page opposite. For Waldseemüller's name was substituted the *Gymnasium Vosagense*. A similar ignoring of the authorship of Waldseemüller is remarked in the *Cosmographia* or world-map itself. It bears neither the author's name nor any indication of the place where it was published. Evidently if Walter Lud had agreed to pay for the expenses of publication, he meant to have at least some of the credit of authorship and to prevent the Freiburg geographer from harvesting all the honors. Lud was obstinate in this view; for, not content to issue the second edition, already described, he issued a third, bearing date August 29, 1507, printed at St. Dié. While this edition was a word for word copy of the second edition, it was entirely reset, as appears from the distribution of the matter on the several pages. Strange to say, there exists a fourth edition of the *Introduction*, also dated August 29, also issued at St. Dié and printed from the same type as the third issue, and yet essentially different. For on the first, second, fifth and sixth leaves we find restored the text of the first edition, that is to say, the dedication to Maximilian I. by Ilacomilus, Waldseemüller's academic name, and the verses ascribing the authorship of the work to him. It seems hardly likely that Walter Lud would publish on the same day the same work in two such contradictory forms. As the date at that time did not appear on the title page, but was relegated to the last page of the book, it is quite conceivable that the publisher of this fourth edition, wishing to do justice to Waldseemüller's claims to the authorship, substituted the first, second, fifth and sixth pages of the original edition for the corresponding ones of the third, overlooking the date at the end. But if not issued on August 29, 1507, as the colophon declares, when was the fourth edition published? D'Avezac thinks that this tardy reparation to Waldseemüller was the consequence of the author's protestations in the *Margarita Philosophica* against the injustice done to him by his rivals in the publication of his World Map. This would throw back the issue of the fourth edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* until the middle of the year 1508.¹¹ Whether in those days types would be locked up so long may well be doubted, but we must not forget that the printers of St. Dié were not ordinary business men. D'Avezac's view is exposed to another objection. Waldseemüller himself, in 1509, published through John Grüninger at Strassburg a fifth edition of this celebrated little pamphlet. Does it seem likely that if in 1508 Walter

¹¹ The letter to Ringmann bears no date. The book has the date 1508. The preface was written shortly after Shrove Tuesday in 1508. This letter may have been written but a short time before the publication of the book, as Waldseemüller's treatise is a supplement to the last book of the work.

Lud or any one else had published the fourth edition, which surely did ample justice to his rights as to the authorship, Waldseemüller should proceed the following year to publish a new edition at Strassburg? But it is not our purpose to discuss this bibliographical problem here.

We see our hero's path was by no means strewn with roses. He had worked for months and years to construct his great map, and now his honors were claimed by others. Walter Lud, even before the 25th of April, 1507, had quarreled with Waldseemüller, and four months later was still doing his best to deprive him of the credit due him for his work as designer of the world map and author of the *Introduction*. Had Lud lived in the twentieth century we should denounce him as a literary robber. But in 1507 literary property and authors' rights were ideas hardly known. Copyright was unthought of. Printers printed or reprinted whatever they thought would bring them profit, without asking leave of writer or first publisher. The *Cosmographiae Introductio* itself, wholly apart from the wrong done to Martin Waldseemüller, was a glaring instance of literary pilfering. More than half the booklet consisted of the "Four Voyages" of Amerigo Vespucci, and yet we have no reason to think that Amerigo ever consented to their publication by the St. Dié printers or, for that matter, by any publisher. So Walter Lud's conceptions of literary property were elementary. No doubt he thought that the man that furnished the shekels for the publication deserved fully as much credit as the man that furnished the brains. By ascribing the work to the College of St. Dié he did justice to three men, if he did injustice to one. For had not Ringmann furnished the eulogistic distichs and revised the Latin text of the map? Had not Basin translated the "Four Voyages?" And had not he himself paid for the publication? We must not, therefore, measure Lud's offense by modern standards. Indeed, though the Freiburg geographer felt the injustice done him, yet he bore it like a gentleman. Not a word of vituperation; his protest consists of a simple statement of the facts. We cannot help respecting the modest, self-possessed scholar, who firmly insisted on his rights, but avoided all vulgarity. He had his reward. His claims were admitted even by those who had wronged him, and Waldseemüller died as canon of St. Dié.

We have given a somewhat lengthy account of Waldseemüller's trouble, not only because it illuminates literary conditions at the beginning of the sixteenth century and illustrates our hero's character, but also because Waldseemüller's world map of 1507, with accompanying *Introduction*, were the works that definitely gave to the New World the name of America. The two publications were

the Freiburg geographer's most noted achievement, the immortal parts, so to say, of the man; but were they in themselves less important, they would claim our attention because of the influence they exerted. We have assisted at their birth; let us briefly trace their fate.

Columbus discovered America, and yet the western continent bears the name of another, and that other a man of whom it is impossible to prove that he ever commanded a ship as captain. How is this to be explained? The world in general for centuries took the name as a matter of fact, as it does to-day. It is Alexander von Humboldt who first succeeded in arousing interest in the problem of the origin and history of the name America and made a great step towards its solution. He it was that drew attention to the *Cosmographiæ Introductio*, and especially to the famous passage, so often reproduced, of which the translation is as follows:

"But now these parts [Asia, Africa, Europe] have been more fully explored, and now (as will be seen in what follows) a fourth part has been discovered by Americus Vespucius, and I do not see why it should not be called after its discoverer, a man of bright intellect, Amerige or America, that is to say, the land of Americus, since both Europe and Asia have received their names from women. Its situation and the customs of its inhabitants will be clearly understood from the 'Four Voyages' of Americus, which are subjoined."¹²

Here, then, in a treatise intended to explain a cartographical work we have the first proposal to call the world discovered by Columbus America. We have also the author's reason for so naming the newly discovered land. It had been discovered by Americus Vespucius. How could a well informed man, a specialist in geography, conceive the idea that Vespucci discovered America?

To answer this question we must again emphasize the fact that Waldseemüller wrote four hundred years ago. At that time news traveled far more slowly than now. There were no newspapers; printing was in its infancy. There were few readers; without many and cheap books general education is impossible. Without newspapers and readers news travels slowly and fame falls to the lot of the few. Conversely, few crave for fame or for what is often taken for fame, notoriety. The modern craze for notoriety was unknown in Columbus' day, and men did not have recourse to trickery to advertise themselves, nor did they blow their own trumpets. So it came about that Columbus found no time to spread the fame of his discovery, but left his deeds to establish his reputation. It is true Columbus' letter announcing his discovery of the Indies was published in Italy, France and Germany in ten editions between the years 1493 and 1505,¹³ but each edition hardly exceeded a thousand

¹² From Waldseemüller's *Cosmographiæ Introductio*.

copies and reached only a small circle of readers. So it might well happen that the geographers of the puny village in Lorraine heard nothing of the achievements of the Genoese discoverer, especially as, so far as we know, the press did nothing to spread the fame of his later voyages, nor of his discovery of the great western continent. Meantime there had appeared a new discoverer, one whose tale was not a brief bald recital of geographic facts, but whose pen portrayed the strange wonders of a new world. This was Americus Vespucci, of Florence. We have no reason to think that Vespucci himself caused the publication of his letter to Lorenzo Pier Francesco dei Medici. The first edition known to us of the booklet appeared neither in Portugal, where the writer resided at the time, nor in Spain, where he went from Portugal, nor in Italy, where dwelt the addressee of the letter, but in Paris, from the press of Jehan de Lambert, in a Latin translation made by Fra Giovanni de Giocondo. But the Florentine's naïve recital of the strange manners and customs of the natives of the new world, for such he pronounced the new found lands to be, and the hair-breadth escapes of himself and his companions evidently took the popular fancy and excited curiosity. Between 1503 and 1508, that is to say between the first publication of the letter to Lorenzo dei Medici and the publication of Waldseemüller's map, some fifteen editions of the same appeared in Latin and German translations, mostly in France and Germany. One of the earliest of the publishers of the pamphlet had the happy idea of taking from the text the expression "new world" and placing it in its title in large, striking type. The book accordingly as "Novus Mudus" drew all the more attention and gave to the new discoveries a complexion wholly absent in the letter of Columbus to Raphael de Sanxis. That this remarkable story of the discovery of a new world made a profound impression on the geographers of St. Dié is apparent from Ringmann's republishing the "Novus Mundus" in 1505 from the press of Andreas Hüpfuff, as well as from their inducing their patron, the Duke of Lorraine, to secure for them the letter to Pietro Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence, usually called the "Four Voyages of Americus Vespucius." From neither the "Novus Mundus" nor the "Four Voyages," in which the name of Columbus hardly appears and his merits are certainly not dwelt upon,¹⁴ could the St. Dié cartographer so much as guess

¹³ They were as follows: In 1493 four Latin editions, without date and place; one Latin edition at Rome; one Latin edition at Paris. In 1494 Latin edition at Basel. In 1497 German edition at Strassburg. In 1505 Italian edition at Venice.

¹⁴ These letters of Vespucci were simple recitals of his own voyages, and seem to be the jottings down of the mariner during his travels. His silence regarding the explorations of his predecessors must not, therefore, be judged to be an intentional ignoring of the credit due to them.

the real state of the case, the prominence of the Genoese and the comparative insignificance of the Florentine explorer. Waldseemüller was concerned not with the practical importance of the discoveries in the West and East Indies, but with their bearing on the picture of the world handed down by Ptolemy; in other words, on theoretical science. So it came about that the story of Vespucci satisfied him, that the Florentine was the real discoverer of the new world and that after him it should be called America.

We may now pursue the history of Waldseemüller's world map. In his marine map, published in 1516, the author informs us that one thousand copies of the map were issued; in his letter to Ringmann (1508)¹⁵ he states that the chart had been scattered over the world, and that it had brought him fame and glory. In the same year the Benedictine abbot, John Heidenberg, of Trittenheim, the well-known humanist Trithemius, speaks in highly commendatory terms to his friend, William de Velde, of a globe and map published at Strassburg and purchased by him at a very moderate price.¹⁶ It seems all but certain that Trithemius' map was our map of 1507. In 1508 the famous German geographer and globe designer, Johann Schoener, drew two very much reduced copies of Waldseemüller's chart of 1507, which were found not so many years ago in the university libraries of Bonn and Munich by Von Wieser and Elter.¹⁷ The Polish geographer, John Studniczka, copied into his geographical treatise the two small hemispheres which Waldseemüller placed in the upper part of his great map to illustrate on the one hand the world of Ptolemy and on the other the world found by the Spanish and Portuguese discoverers. It would take up too much space to trace all the plagiarisms of Waldseemüller's map that were perpetrated during the next hundred years. Suffice it to say that even as late as Mercator we find evidence of the persisting influence of the great map, whose fortunes we are tracing. Naturally the plagiarists were in no haste to publish the name of the man whose work they appropriated. And so it happened that ere long Waldseemüller's name fell more and more into oblivion. In the early years of the seventeenth century the Flemish cartographer, Abraham Ortelius, queries whether Waldseemüller and Ilacomilus are one or two persons. Thereafter the Freiburg scholar almost disappears from the annals of learning

¹⁵ See above, p. 7a.

¹⁶ The price asked for Lawrence Fries' reduced edition of Waldseemüller's "*Carta Marina*" was five gulden. It may be inferred that the great map of 1507 hardly cost more than ten gulden.

¹⁷ To Schoener belonged at one time the Waldseemüller world map and his "*Carta Marina*," which were recently found by Father Joseph Fischer, S. J., in the Castle of Wolfegg.

until Von Humboldt revived his memory some three-quarters of a century ago. Humboldt, who studied the early history of American discovery with unprecedented zeal and perseverance, searched high and low for the first map that bore the name of America, the Waldseemüller mappemonde of 1507, as he correctly inferred from the *Cosmographiac Introductio*. But success did not reward his research. After him all the great Americanists of the nineteenth century—Winsor, Harrisse, Ruge, Nordenskiöld, Von Wieser—took part in the fruitless hunt until the great Nordenskiöld was all but convinced that Waldseemüller had never published the *Cosmographia* of which he had written the *Introduction*. Both his fac-simile atlas and his *Periplus* (1897) took this skeptical view. Still the last work was printed only three years before the Freiburg humanist's work was brought to light. The honor of making this discovery was reserved for the Jesuit Father Joseph Fischer. While making researches touching the Norse discoveries in Greenland the learned Jesuit unexpectedly came upon the two great world maps of Waldseemüller, the map of 1507 and the *Carta Marina* of 1516. Towards the end of 1903 he and his former professor in cartography, the distinguished Dr. Franz von Wieser, published a magnificent fac-simile edition of this monumental work, together with an exhaustive commentary, in which no pains were spared to shed light on the work and its history, an achievement which has received the highest commendation from the first authorities on cartography in Germany.¹⁸

We take pleasure in inserting here the judgment of one of the highest authorities in the field of science, Professor Dr. Wagner. It appeared in No. 6 of this year's *Gelchrten Anzeigen*, of Göttingen, in a notice extending over fourteen pages. Here it is:

"It was especially fortunate that the discovery in question was made by one who is thoroughly acquainted with the infancy of cartography. A scholar of Franz von Wieser, Joseph Fischer, by publishing an excellent study on the discoveries of the Northmen in America, Freiburg, 1902 [English version, St. Louis, 1903], has just given undoubted proof of his ability to clear up the dark story of the beginnings of cartography at the time of the renascence of Ptolemy, both by his indefatigable search after new authorities and by his adroit combinations. And he could not have found a more useful co-laborer than the man [F. von Wieser] whose acquaintance with that age is more complete than that of any other adept of our science at the present day."

The result of this discovery has been to call renewed attention

¹⁸ Many of their results have been embodied in this life of Waldseemüller.

to the scientific merits of the Freiburg cartographer, and to vindicate for him a prominent place among its promoters. Incidentally it has also made us acquainted with Waldseemüller's methods of work and given us new insight into his character.

We have thus acquired some idea of the influence exercised by our map on contemporary and later science. Let us now study it for a moment in itself and as an expression of the ways and methods of the author.

Waldseemüller was a typical scholar of his day. He prized and cherished the older learning, but he also welcomed the new. He was essentially a disciple of Ptolemy; the basis of our map was the Ulm Ptolemy of 1884. The projection of his map was the old Ptolemaic projection. His picture of central Europe and western Asia was Ptolemaic. But he did not reject modern lights. For the north of Europe he followed Claudius Clavus, for central and eastern Asia, so far as the text goes, the great Venetian, Marco Polo, and for the outline an unknown work based on Marco Polo's books. He was specially interested in the Spanish and Portuguese transatlantic discoveries, and was here guided by Amerigo Vespucci and the Canerio map, which he thought, and probably correctly thought, to be founded on the cartographic work of the Florentine navigators. He was not only progressive, but in his progressiveness he displayed good judgment, for he could have had no safer guides than Claudius Clavus and Marco Polo, and the Canerio map, which was the only chart of the western continent available to him, was the best and fullest he could have found at the time. He was evidently guided by the same spirit which directed Regiomontanus, Nicholas of Cusa, Behaim and Toscanelli, the spirit of Dom Manuel of Portugal and Columbus.

What shall we say of his judgment of the value of the transatlantic discoveries? Of course, Vespucci had declared that he had found a "new world," but this expression may refer to the novel character of the inhabitants and of the products of the countries found as well as to the view that America was a fourth continent which belonged to neither Europe, Asia nor Africa. Indeed, it is very doubtful that Vespucci meant to claim credit for the discovery of a new fourth continent. But Waldseemüller clearly calls the new land a fourth continent. It is true that later, when he had become acquainted with the achievements of Columbus and had come under the influence of Columbus' views, he took a step backward. In the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513 the western continent no longer bears the name of America, and in the *Carta Marina* of 1516 he calls it Cuba, a part of Asia. He left a gap of thousands of miles, between the lands visited by Marco Polo and what he

now took to be the east of Asia. The geographical discoveries had succeeded each other so rapidly that the scientific mind of the time was unable to follow and assimilate them. Cartographic notions were in a state of flux and did not crystallize for many a year. Else how explain the name of Indies generally given to Spanish America? or the name of Indians bestowed on the natives of English and French as well as of Spanish America? But if the *Carta Marina* is in this respect evidence of retrogression, what shall we say of Waldseemüller's abandonment of the new name America? Of course, when he became convinced that the land of Cuba was not a fourth continent, but merely a part of Asia, the name America was superfluous; its omission was a confession of having blundered. It was something more, however; it was an act of reparation. For the *Carta Marina* openly recants the statement of the *Cosmographia* and the *Cosmographiae Introductio* that Americus Vesputius had discovered the new world. Columbus, the *Carta Marina* tells us, was the first discoverer, Pedralvarez¹⁹ the second and Amerigo Vespucci the third. As Cabral did not discover Brazil till April 22, 1500, Waldseemüller must, when he published the *Carta Marina*, have thought Vespucci's first voyage to have taken place later than 1500, though the "Four Voyages" assigns Vespucci's first voyage to the year 1497.²⁰ It is evident from his erasing the name America from both the world map in the Ptolemy of 1513 and the *Carta Marina* (1516), as well as from his emphatically attributing the honor of first discovering the new world to the Genoese admiral, that Waldseemüller meant to correct his former error and make reparation to Columbus. We admire his honesty and love of justice, though they did not repair the wrong done. The thousand copies of the great wall map of 1507 spoke not only to the scholar in his study, but to the public in general, and the men who pilfered from the geographer of St. Dié could not fail to spread and perpetuate his unintentional error. We may regret that the western continent was not named after Columbus; it is a satisfaction to know that he was deprived of this honor neither through malice on the part of Waldseemüller nor, as far as we know, through a desire to glorify himself on the part of Amerigo Vespucci. We are convinced that Amerigo Vespucci never intentionally had a part in appropriating the honors due to Columbus. But the entire story of the Florentine still stands in need of being cleared up. Nothing would contribute more to throw

¹⁹ Pedralvarez Cabral is meant. While sailing with fifteen Portuguese ships to the East Indies, he was driven by a tempest to Brazil, which he touched on April 22, 1500.

²⁰ Amerigo Vespucci returned from his voyage with Alonso de Hojieda at the end of June, 1500; some say in April.

light on his story than the publication of a critical edition of Vespucci's letters. What is most tantalizing is the knowledge that such an edition has lain ready for the printer for four years. The learned Florentine scholar, Signor Gustavo Uzielli, has been patiently waiting for the Italian Geographical Society to redeem its promise to publish the invaluable collection, only to be disappointed. Can nothing be done to hasten its issue? It is a curious coincidence that the man who deprived Columbus of his due honors in naming the new world was himself almost robbed of the credit of being its godfather.

We must not conclude this discussion of Waldseemüller's world map of 1507 without giving our readers a short description of this famous cartographical monument. It is, as the author himself states in the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, an unusually large chart, four feet six inches in height by eight feet in length. It is made up of twelve folios, laid side by side in three rows, four folios in each row. Each folio measures about eighteen by twenty-four inches. The map is engraved on wood and done with surprising neatness and precision. The folios fit one another to a nicety. The upper part of the map offers us two small hemispheres, each in charge of a representative of geographical science. The eastern hemisphere, that known to the ancients and figured in Ptolemy's great atlas, is exhibited by the old Alexandrian astronomer himself, while near the newly discovered lands stands the figure of Amerigo Vespucci. The name identifies each figure. The size of the map proclaims that it is meant for a wall map, one of the earliest if not the earliest of its kind. It also explains why not one of the thousand copies has survived. The exemplar found by Father Fischer at Wolfegg is a proof preserved because it was bound in with a volume of engravings which had once belonged to Waldseemüller's younger contemporary, the cartographer Johannes Schoener. The binding had preserved it. The map in every part is a creditable specimen of the art of wood cutting, especially the figures, though in this respect it is excelled by the *Carta Marina*, the art work of which strongly suggests the hand of Albrecht Durer, or at any rate of his school. The technical perfection of the work renders it likely that it was not engraved at the small printing establishment of St. Dié, but rather at the neighboring town of Strassburg, which boasted of several able engravers at the time. The map bears neither the name of the author nor that of St. Dié, where the *Introduction* suggests that it was printed. But it corresponds exactly with the description of his large map given by Waldseemüller in the treatise which was written to accompany it. He tells us that this map was very large, made up of several folios, distinguishes the realms

of the great sovereigns by their emblems, indicates the shallow parts of the ocean by crosses and gives to the new world the name of America. All these peculiarities the Wolfegg map offers. It is undoubtedly Waldseemüller map of 1507. The magnificent facsimile of our chart published by Fischer and Von Wieser, which should be in every American college library, cannot fail to impress all who see it with the care, precision and taste of the author of the original.

At the same time as he published his great map Waldseemüller published a globe. He himself announces both the map and the globe in his *Cosmographiae Introductio*. In size we are informed by him it was far inferior to the map. Besides in his letter to Johann Auerbach, written on the 7th of April, 1507, we read: "The globe I have gotten up in accordance with the world map of Ptolemy is not yet printed, but it will be printed within a month."²¹ In fine, at the close of the *Introduction* the author remarks that in designing the map he had placed the equator according to Ptolemy, while on the globe he had been guided in this particular by the Portuguese marine charts. When, however, the map of 1507 was discovered, writers were not wanting who identified the globe with the two small hemispheres printed at the top of the map and described above. But the words of Waldseemüller leave no room for doubt. And, indeed, some years before the discovery of the Wolfegg map L. Gallois²² identified the Waldseemüller globe with the globe gores in the Hauslab-Liechtenstein collection at Vienna, on the ground that the latter fulfils all the demands of the description cited above from the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, which is not true of the little hemispheres on the map. Father Fischer approves of the views of Gallois and is preparing a paper in support of this thesis.²³ For the present we may refer our readers to page 14 of Fischer's and Von Wieser's "The World Maps of Waldseemüller," where he will find a fac-simile of the Hauslab-Liechtenstein gores.

Waldseemüller was still in the midst of his quarrel with Walter Lud about the recognition of his authorship of the *Cosmographia* and its *Introduction* when, as we have seen, his pen produced a new work, a treatise on architecture and perspective for Gregory Reisch's encyclopædia, the *Margarita Philosophica*. Though in itself ephemeral, it proves that he was a scholar of varied interests. Nor did his excursion into the region of art and mathematics tempt him away

²¹ Cf. C. Schmidt. Essay on Ringmann, in the *Mémoires Soc. Arch. de Lorraine*, 1873, p. 227.

²² L. Gallois. *Les Géographes Allemands*, p. 48, and, the same, *Améric Vespuce*, p. 11 ff.

²³ We understand that this important paper will appear in the publications of the United States Catholic Historical Society.

from his principal pursuit—geography. The scheme of publishing a new edition of Ptolemy had taken possession of Waldseemüller and Ringmann, and they did not abandon it. Times had changed. Duke René was dead; the relations of Waldseemüller with Walter Lud were probably altered. The little printing establishment at St. Dié still sent out an occasional work, but for years, as far as we know, Waldseemüller published no work through the St. Dié press. Whatever be the date of the fourth edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, if it is really anterior to the fifth, the recognition of his authorship did not satisfy the injured author. His contribution to the *Margarita Philosophica* had brought him into relations with the Strassburg typographer, Johann Grüninger. It was Grüninger, therefore, who in 1509 published a new—the fifth—edition of the *Introduction*. At the same time Grüninger published a booklet entitled *Globus Mundi, Declaratio Sive Descriptio Mundi*, identical in paper, form and type with the *Cosmographiae Introductio*. Both, moreover, contain the statement that they were proof read by John Adelffus, of Mülingen. All this points to some closer connection between the two booklets, and this indication is strengthened by the reference to a larger map called a *Cosmography* which seems to be identical with Waldseemüller's *Cosmographia*. We translate:

"The distance between two places is not easily determined on this small globe, because all the degrees could not be marked thereon. If you wish to ascertain distances you will consult the larger map of the plane *Cosmographia*, in which you will find the places more surely and correctly according to their longitude and latitude."²⁴

Taking into consideration both the external and the internal evidence, there is little room for doubt that this *Declaratio Mundi* was intended to do the same office for Waldseemüller's globe that the *Cosmographiae Introductio* was meant to do for his planeglobe.

The next work published by the Freiburg cartographer was an "Itinerary Map of Europe," for which Mathias Ringmann wrote an introduction or, as the author calls it in this case *Descriptio Europæ*. This map has been known for some time. Ringmann's *Descriptio*, to which Waldseemüller himself prefixed a *Manuductio in Cartan Europæ*, with a dedication of the to Duke Anthony, son of René, was published by Johann Grüninger at Strassburg in April, 1511,

²⁴ This booklet was an amusing conceit. At the same time it affords clear evidence that the pedagogues of those days were not all mere repeaters of old, long-known tricks. The "Grammar in Pictures" undertakes to teach the eight (*sic*) parts of speech by representing them graphically. The noun is represented by a pastor, the pronoun by his vicar, the verb by the king, the adverb by the queen, the conjunction by the cup-bearer, the preposition by the church warden and the interjection by the fool.

while Waldseemüller's dedication is dated one month earlier. The map was on a large scale, being, in fact, a combination of a number of separate maps in Ptolemy's atlas. For Waldseemüller the work was a kind of side issue, for, as we have seen, since 1505 he had been busy preparing a new edition of Ptolemy.

And thus we return to Waldseemüller's life work, the great Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513, from which, as from the second and third editions of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, every mention of his name has been excluded. We met it at first in the year 1505, two years before the issue of the world map with the name America. We find it referred to in the "Speculum Orbis" of Walter Lud, published at Strassburg in 1507. Lud here declares that he purposes to pay for the publication of this Ptolemy, then in preparation by Martin Waldseemüller, a man extremely well versed in cartography. Again, after the quarrel with Waldseemüller, Walter Lud in his dedication of Ringmann's "Grammatica Figurata,"²⁵ published in St. Dié in 1509, tells the Bishop of Toul that he hopes to publish the Ptolemy in a few months. As late as 1511, in the preface to his last work, the *Descriptio Europæ*, Ringmann²⁶ speaks of his own and his friend's work in preparing a new edition of Ptolemy. Ringman, indeed, in furtherance of the project, made a journey to Italy in 1508. There in Ferrara he met the learned Giles Gregory Giraldi, who aided him by preparing a key to the Greek system of numeration found in Ptolemy. In Italy he met also Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Count of Concordia, the nephew of the great Pico della Mirandola, and like him a man of learning. Pico found an unusually fine Greek codex of Ptolemy's geography, which he placed at Ringmann's disposition and which was used in preparing the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513. From 1505, therefore, until 1511 we have repeated reference to the fact that Waldseemüller and Ringmann were engaged in preparing an edition of Ptolemy's geography which in the earlier years Walter Lud was to have paid for and issued from his press at St. Dié. As late as 1509 his dedication prefixed to the "Grammatica Figurata" speaks of publishing the Ptolemy of Ringmann in a few months.

Still at this very time the honor of publishing the work had been destined to other patrons of science. The great atlas itself is evi-

²⁵ Mathias Ringmann died in that year, while profess at Schlettstadt, at the early age of twenty-nine. His friends Beatus Rhenanus (Bilde) and Johannes Russer erected a monument "to Mathias Ringmann, Philæsius, Vogesigena, who spread the knowledge of literature in Alsace, the eminent Latin and learned Greek scholar."

²⁶ The Latin word is *consummatum est*. Whether this includes the printing is not certain. Fischer and Von Wieser think that the woodcuts of the figures of the winds are too fine to be done in that little village.

dence of this fact. For there we find a letter, dated in 1509, written by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, announcing that he had sent to the editors by Ringmann a fine Greek Ptolemy and exhorting them to persevere in using every effort to perfect their edition of the Ptolemy. It is addressed not to Walter Lud, but to Dr. Jacob Æsztlér and associates. By closer examination the associates are reduced to one, George Ubelin, who published the second edition of the Strassburg Ptolemy (1520). Who were Jacob Æsztlér and George Ubelin? They were lawyers in the ecclesiastical court of the Bishop of Strassburg, doctors of canon law, and therefore probably clerics. The publisher of the Ptolemy was Johann Schott, of Strassburg, after whom the work is sometimes called Schott's Ptolemy.

Waldseemüller had changed patrons; he had gained nothing so far as his fame was concerned. While Ringmann's name is at least referred to in Pico della Mirandola's letter, we shall look in vain for Waldseemüller's in Schott's Ptolemy. True, the story we have told of its preparation and the admitted connection of Ringmann with the work would by themselves convince us that not the two canonists were the authors, but Ringmann's old partner, Ilacomilus. But we are not obliged to base on conjecture our attribution of Schott's Ptolemy to Waldseemüller. We have direct and convincing testimony to this fact. Our witness is Lawrence Fries, city physician of Metz and a noted mathematician. In 1522 John Grüninger, the Strassburg typographer, already well known to our readers, determined to publish a new, reduced edition of Schott's Ptolemy, and engaged Fries to prepare the work. We are not much interested in this geographical venture, for it is a production in every way inferior to the original. What is important for our purpose is a notice found inserted at folio 100, in which we read: "Lest we appear to be elated by the credit which belong to another, we notify our readers that these maps were originally designed by Martin Ilacomylus, now peacefully dead." The maps of the Schott Ptolemy, Fries tells us, were drawn by Waldseemüller. The Freiburg scholar had devoted eight or more years to his masterpiece, and Æsztlér and Ubelin figure as the editors. Such seems to have been the custom of the time, to judge by Waldseemüller's and Ringmann's experience, as well as by the experience of other geographers of their day. These scholars worked for the advancement of science without pay, nay, without the expectation to gather glory and fame by their toil and genius. Should not posterity bestow on them the laurels their contemporaries refused them?

The Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513 is planned on the lines which guided Waldseemüller in designing the map of 1507. He followed

Ptolemy, but did not ignore the progress made by the moderns. Accordingly he divided his atlas into two parts. The first part consists of the traditional twenty-seven maps of the Alexandrian geographer, the second of twenty maps based on more modern data, especially on Portuguese marine maps. As has been already remarked, the newly discovered western continent no longer bears the name of America. The artistic and technical merits of the work are of a high order, in this resembling the Waldseemüller map of 1507. It is worth while to add that in this respect it forms a great contrast to the Fries-Grüniger edition of 1522. The latter issue, which is in every way an inferior piece of work, is also distinguished from the map in the Strassburg Ptolemy by giving to the new world the name of America. We may, therefore, infer that in 1522 the question of naming the western continent was decided. In spite of the fact that the first proposer of the name America had proclaimed Columbus to be the real discoverer of the new world, and though Waldseemüller erased the name America from his later maps, America remained the name of the western continent.

Martin Waldseemüller's cartographical activity did not end with the work he did for the Schott Ptolemy. He published one more large map similar in size and workmanship to the map of 1507, and this time at last he was to have the satisfaction of seeing his work go out under his own name. The new map was entitled *Carta Marina*, and was intended primarily as a guide for navigators. The map itself tells us that it was compiled and designed by Martin Ilacomilus, and completed²⁷ in the town of St. Dié. Its date is 1516. No explanatory text of this chart is known to have been published. The *Carta Marina* shows that when he published it our cartographer's mind had lost none of its acumen and his hand none of its cunning. If we compare it with the map of 1507 it shows a marked advance—not so much in the design of the new as in his picture of the old world. Africa and Northern Europe have been greatly modified, but the greatest changes meet us in the representation of Southern Asia. The two peninsulas of India on the former map are drawn according to Ptolemy's ideas, and are far from correctly figured; in the *Carta Marina*, which follows the Portuguese Portulane, they are drawn with approximate correctness. These parts of the chart, as well as the western continent, are manifestly copied from Canerio; in parts the resemblance is so great, both maps coinciding even in size, that the one seems to be a tissue paper copy of the other. Fischer and Von Wieser sum up their opinion in the words: "The *Carta Marina* of Waldseemüller is a printed edition of the Canerio map."

²⁷ Gaspar and Miguel Cortereal were two Portuguese navigators who, in 1500, seem to have discovered New Foundland and Labrador.

This expression must not, however, be interpreted to mean that the *Carta Marina* is a slavish copy of the Canerio map. To do so would be to do a gross injustice to the designer. He was not a man to suppress his own judgment. Accordingly we find that in the interior of Asia and Africa the new map is both a corrected and an enlarged version of Canerio. In the north of Europe Waldseemüller manifestly follows a low German model, for many names of places show low German or Norse forms. The agreement with the Canerio map appears especially in the outlines firstly of America, secondly of South Africa, thirdly of Greenland, fourthly of the land of Cortereal,²⁸ fifthly of North Africa, especially the shores of the Red Sea, and sixthly of India.

The *Carta Marina*, as far as we know, was Waldseemüller's last work. As we have said, it was published at St. Dié, which therefore saw the beginning and the end of Waldseemüller's career as an author. As is true of the lives of most literary and scientific men, the story of the life of the Freiburg cartographer is the story of his works. All we know of him after the appearance of the *Carta Marina* is that he died, probably in the year 1522, as canon of St. Dié.²⁹ At all events, when Lawrence Fries published the Ptolemy of 1522 he speaks of him as dead.

To the end of his life, therefore, Waldseemüller remained an honored member of the faculty of St. Dié. His quarrel with Walter Lud, which lasted so many years, had not shaken his position in the Gymnasium of the Vosges. Either their literary differences had not irretrievably embittered the two men of science, or the canon law protected the Freiburg canon against the hostility of Walter Lud. Whatever be the solution of the problem, literary property in the sixteenth century was almost an unknown conception. Author's and publisher's rights were in their infancy. Here, again, one of Waldseemüller's works, the Ptolemy of 1513, was one of the pioneers of copyright. To Æsztler and Ubelin Charles V. accorded the privilege of being the sole publishers for four years. That the privilege was not without value we may infer from Ubelin's issuing a second edition in 1518.

Martin Waldseemüller's name, which even in 1570 had fallen into oblivion to such a degree that the cartographer Abraham Ortelius expressed his doubt whether Waldseemüller and Ilacomylus were the same person, has been revived by modern science. Since Alexander von Humboldt, he has been known as probably the man who

²⁹ So Fischer and Von Wieser, *The World Maps of Martin Waldseemüller*, p. 22, foot note. Their authority is L. Gallois, *Améric Vespucce*, p. 31 ff.

²⁸ Fischer and Von Wieser sum up their opinion in the words: "The *Carta Marina* of Waldseemüller is a printed edition of the Canerio."

gave its name to the new world, Fischer set at rest all doubts on this point. He found the map which is, so to say, America's baptismal certificate. Fischer and Von Wieser have shown that Waldseemüller was not merely a geographical curiosity, but that as a cartographer he influenced for upwards of a hundred years the course of cartographic science. His story is by no means a story of success. Ability, industry, learning, originality were his, yet his life was a struggle, a partly fruitless struggle, to have his work acknowledged and his merit recognized. The chief product of his scientific toil, the masterpiece of his life's work, the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513, was claimed by others, and only a lucky accident has preserved for us the testimony that the achievement was his. His contemporaries allowed him scant justice; it was reserved for our age to bring to life and light his work and to do homage to his name.

CHARLES GEORGE HERBERMANN.

New York.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

IT IS difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy how many have given assent to the principles of so-called Christian Science. In 1888 Mrs. Eddy claimed more than a million followers scattered throughout the world.¹ In 1902 Mark Twain wrote that in America alone there were a million members of the sect.² The 1904 World's Almanac lowers the claim of Christian Science to seven hundred and sixty-nine churches and societies and about fifty thousand members. Let us suppose these last and more modest figures are near the truth. They do not tax our credulity, yet they give us some surprise and attract our serious attention. We must admit that "Christian Science is a thing we can no longer ignore. It is a force that must be seriously reckoned with."³ It has already duped too many, and holds them with a grasp that neither facts and reasons nor gibes and taunts have power to loosen. Its spread will not be thwarted while most Christians sit idly by and raise no voice of earnest protest against the un-Christian blasphemies and unscientific vagaries that Mrs. Eddy has sent a-mas-

¹ This claim is made in the one hundred and thirty-fifth edition of "Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures." When we note only the page, we refer to this text-book of Mrs. Eddy.

² Cf. *North American Review*, December, 1902.

³ Cf. Rev. A. F. Underhill, in the preface to his "Valid Objections to So-called Christian Science."

querading under the holy and noble guise of Christianity and science.

To many Christian Science is but a name. Others know no more about it than that it is something like faith-cure, and its members claim to heal the sick by making people think they are not sick. Yet Christian Science pretends to be a system of metaphysics and religion, and it goes without saying that it is deemed by its votaries to be really Christian and scientific. Like the positivism of Comte, it is refuted for most readers merely by an exposition of its creed. We shall try to ransack the books of Mrs. Eddy, to find out what she means and to form some clear and crisp notions of the tenets of her sect.

What, then, does Mrs. Eddy mean? That's the question. Just what Mrs. Eddy means is the hardest thing in the world to get at, so elusive and Protean is the religion that she teaches. As a matter of fact, Christian Scientists insist that we who are on the outside cannot get into the inner meanings of their esoteric dogmas. Why not? Because we do not accept them with trust in Mrs. Eddy; we read her words "in a purely critical vein." Mr. W. D. McCracken, of the Christian Science Publication Committee, says that if we "approach the subject in a purely critical vein" we shall for this very reason miss the real signification of Christian Science.⁴ Why, unless we "approach the subject in a purely critical vein" we can give only that definition of Christian Science which will probably be found in the dictionaries of the next century, and say that it is a form of religion invented and propagated by Mrs. Eddy. No, we cannot keep away from this "purely critical vein." The man of thought and prudence will not be so foolhardy and heedless as to swallow Mrs. Eddy's doses of diluted science and disintegrated Christianity without a critical and painstaking analysis of what she says and what she means to say.

In her text-book, "Science and Health," Mrs. Eddy lays down a definition of her new religion. This definition is not built up according to the rules of Aristotelian logic—of course not—we should never expect any Aristotelian logic from Mrs. Eddy. Her definitions generally defy analysis, when approached "in a purely critical vein." In point of fact, we can scarcely ferret out the meaning of this definition at all. Why, then, do we give it? Because it is pellucid enough to enable us through it to catch a glimpse, if not of her thought, at least of the obscurity of the verbiage with which Mrs. Eddy is wont to enwrap her thought. Here is the definition: "Christian Science is based on the teachings of Scripture which it interprets, giving the Christ principle

⁴ Cf. *North American Review*, vol. 173, p. 232.

and rule in Divine Metaphysics which heals the sick and sinner." Such a definition speaks for itself.

There are four fundamental principles to this new form of Christianity. They are not to be found in the New Testament; yet they are the quintessence of Christ's teaching as discovered by Mrs. Eddy. These four principles are undisguised and unadulterated Pantheism; yet Mrs. Eddy claims that they are self-evident. "Even if read backward, these propositions will be found to agree in statement and *proof*."⁵ Indeed, Mrs. Eddy makes so much of these assumptions that we have little doubt she would agree with Mark Twain's Christian Scientist and say: "You can jumble it all up, and it makes no difference. . . . Read backwards, or forwards, or perpendicularly, or at any given angle, these four propositions will always be found to agree in statement and in *proof*."⁶

These wonderful, self-evident, fundamental principles make up the *scientific statement*, the cure-all creed of Christian Science:

1. God is All in all.
2. God is Good; Good is Mind.
3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter.
4. Life, God, omnipotent Good deny death, evil, sin, disease.

From these four fundamental principles flow two very important *scientific* definitions. They are as clear-cut and as logical as we may hope to find any of Mrs. Eddy's *scientific* definitions. We give them just as we find them, jumbled and tumbled together in their author's inevitable and hopeless jargon:

1. Scientific Definition of Immortal Mind.

God: Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind.

Man: God's universal idea, individual, perfect, eternal.

Idea: An image in the Mind; the immediate object of Understanding.

2. Scientific Definition of Mortal Mind.

1st degree [unreality]. *Physical*: Passions and appetites, fear, depraved will, pride, envy, deceit, hatred, revenge, sin, disease, death.

2d degree [transitional qualities: evil disappearing]. *Moral*: Honesty, affection, compassion, hope, faith, meekness, temperance.

3d degree [reality; spiritual salvation]. *Spiritual*: Faith, wisdom, power, purity, understanding, health, love.⁷

If this hodge-podge means anything, it means Ideal Pantheism,

⁵ Page 7.

⁶ Cf. "Christian Science and the Book of Mrs. Eddy." *Cosmopolitan*, October, 1899.

⁷ Page 9.

such as Fichte, Hegel, Schelling and others evolved long before Mrs. Eddy put her new form of Christianity on the market.

Let us first examine the Idealism of so-called Christian Science. It is not, of course, admitted by Mrs. Eddy, yet cannot be reasonably denied. She assumes, nay, rather, she *proves* by the foregoing *scientific* definitions that "matter has no real existence."⁸ "Matter is nothing beyond an image in mortal mind."⁹ "The Science of Mind shows conclusively how it is that matter seemeth to be, but is not. Divine Science, rising above physical theories, excludes matter, resolves things into thoughts and replaces the objects of material sense with spiritual ideas."¹⁰ Then the fat man is not a man of fat, after all, but only a man of fatty belief—he only thinks he is fat. He should "rise above physical theories" and replace his fat by "spiritual ideas." Is not that what Mrs. Eddy means? Yes, that is practically what she says. One of her pupils wrote her: "How can I believe there is no such thing as matter when I weigh over two hundred pounds and carry this weight daily?" She answered: "By learning that matter is but manifest mortal mind"—manifest unreality, a dream, a morbid hallucination not unlike a nightmare. "You entertain an *adipose belief* of yourself as a substance." Transfer the epithet, and, presto, 'tis done—you are not an adipose substance, you have only an adipose belief of substance.

Since matter is nothing, there is no such thing as nerves, pain, sickness, death, sin. They are all "errors of mortal mind." "There is no pain in truth and no Truth in pain; no nerve in Mind, no Mind in nerve; no matter in Mind, no Mind in matter; no matter in Life, no Life in matter; no matter in Good, no Good in matter."¹¹ "The only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief."¹² "Death is an illusion, the lie of life in matter. . . . Any material evidence of death is false."¹³

What, then, are sin, sickness, pain and death? Only images in mortal mind—not in immortal Mind, for that is God—but in mortal mind. In all her works Mrs. Eddy is ever harping on one string—"the errors of mortal mind." What is mortal mind? "Mortal mind designates something which has no real existence."¹⁴ "There is really no such thing as mortal mind."¹⁵ Mortal mind is nothing at all, just as "mortal man, man as we know him, is a material falsity."

⁸ Page 575.

⁹ Page 10.

¹⁰ Page 17.

¹¹ Page 7.

¹² Page 468.

¹³ Page 575.

¹⁴ Page 8.

¹⁵ Page 419.

So the "errors of mortal mind" turn out to be the errors of nothing at all! Sickness, pain and death are only the subjective state of nothing;¹⁶ images of nothing in nothing! Mrs. Eddy would be clearer if she set it down boldly that mortal man, mortal mind, sickness, pain, death and all else except God are nothing at all; but clear thinking is not one of the wares she barter—she long ago found it to be one of the "errors of mortal mind." However, she can scarcely have the hardihood to deny that she teaches Idealism.

It is Pantheism that she openly rejects, though, with delicious inconsistency, she teaches it as covertly and as boldly as Idealism.

"Mind," she says, "is the only I, or *Us*—the one God." "There is but one *Us*." The *Ego* of Pantheism she does not like so well as the *Us* of Eddyism. The two are the same except in name. This new form of Pantheism also appears in terms that connote a smattering of Kant. "In Science, Mind is one—including noumena and phenomena, God and His thoughts."¹⁷ The Kantian phraseology is here distorted. According to Kant, noumenon is the thing in itself, phenomenon is the thing as it appears to us; there are many noumena and phenomena outside of God. According to Mrs. Eddy, Mind is God, and man is God's thought; Mind includes God (noumena) and His thoughts (phenomena); therefore, God includes God and man. This is Pantheism.

Again and again the same false philosophy crops out. She admits the existence of nothing but transcendental Being, Truth, Beauty; and makes these terms synonymous with God. God is the only real principle; all that is real is Mind, *i. e.*, God. "God is divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love. Are these terms synonymous? They are. They refer to one absolute God, and nothing else. . . . Is there more than one principle? There is not."¹⁸ The only reality, then, is one soul, one principle of one life; and soul, principle and life are God. The Ideal Pantheist postulates just such a foundation for his superstructure of philosophical thought.

Such is Mrs. Eddy's theory of Christianity—Ideal Pantheism in a new and more specious form—"a theory," says Dean Hart, of Denver, in the *New York Sun*, "which needs nothing but its statement for its refutation."

This refutation will be helped on by a brief outline of the career of Mrs. Eddy. We take our facts from her "Retrospection and Introspection," and from articles of Mark Twain and J. M. Buckley

¹⁶ Page 8.

¹⁷ Page 8.

¹⁸ Page 461.

in the *North American Review*. Mary Morse Baker seems to have suffered from the "errors of mortal mind" at the very dawn of reason. When only eight years of age, she used to hear a voice that called her by name—Mary, Mary, Mary—three times in ascending scale. Even then she seems to have had a precocious belief that sound was an unreality, and neither quavers nor crotchets went up or down. For during twelve months Mary was "quite contrary," and gave no heed to the ascending scale. At last the example of little Samuel led her to pluck up courage enough to answer the voice. But the spell was broken; the voice was not such as had come to Samuel, it had nothing at all to say and was heard no more. Mary Morse Baker had little schooling; her father thought her brain too big for her body. She studied at home; but, after her discovery of Christian Science, strange to say, most of her knowledge "vanished like a dream." This singularly honest confession should be kept in mind by any one who reads the writings of Mrs. Eddy "in a purely critical vein," and without being prepossessed with and hampered by an irremediable bias to the side of her assumed infallibility. Since Mrs. Eddy's knowledge has all oozed out and "vanished like a dream," the topsy-turvy condition of the output of her fertile but poorly worked brain is no longer a secret. The dream—or ooze—theory is the key which unlocks and fully discloses that secret. Though in this wise bereft of knowledge, Mary was much comforted by matrimony. We can scarcely be persuaded that matrimony was not a reality to her. In 1843 she married Colonel Glover, of South Carolina. While "yellow fever was raging" in Wilmington, North Carolina, "the insidious disease proved fatal" to the Colonel. Strange that "an image in mortal mind," in nothing at all, should be so real as to be *insidious*, to *rage* and to *prove fatal* to an unreality like the Colonel! Surely Mrs. Eddy is now confessing "the errors of *her* mortal mind." It was after this first marriage that she thought Mary Morse Baker Glover would be too long; so the *Us* wished to drop a name. She took another instead, and erred egregiously by the unfortunate "image in mortal mind" which made her Mary Morse Baker Glover Patterson.¹⁰ Dr. Patterson was envious and naughty; he eloped with a married woman. A *real* divorce followed. In telling her fate our heroine seems, in very truth, almost to find consolation in a trifling *unreality*. She writes that her rival was "from one of the wealthiest families." We would say nothing at all about these romances and marriages had not the discoverer of Christian Science laid her private career bare before all who should read "Retrospec-

¹⁰ Mrs. Eddy does not name Dr. Patterson in "Retrospection and Introspection." We take his name from the other authorities already mentioned.

tion and Introspection." We do not wish to ridicule that private career, but to show how poorly it fits in with the theories of Christian Science. If matter is nothing, marriage is useless and absurd. We are at a loss to see how, at the age of sixty, in 1877, our much married founder of Christian Science so yielded to the reality of matter as to become Mary Morse Baker Glover Patterson Eddy. She has not married for twenty-seven years. She must have been "more than over shoes in love" with Mr. Eddy. To her last name there was too much of matter—too much of unreality—and some of its nothingness had to be lopped off or gouged out; it now reads Mary Baker G. Eddy.

Of course, this career never went on. Colonel Glover never was. Doctor Patterson did not elope. Mr. Eddy was only an "error of mortal mind," like the rest who had preceded him. Is not this a proper deduction from Mrs. Eddy's own principles? We do not wrong her. At least in this instance, she is quite true to her premises. Here is precisely what she says of the story of her life: "This is but the record of dreams, not of real existence."²⁰ Shall we allow a John-a-dreams to palm off hallucinations as revelations, Eddyism as Christianity? Eddyism is "such stuff as dreams are made on;" Christianity is not.

We say Eddyism is a dream, yet it has in it a dreadful reality. It starts out with no reality, but only a dream of Christ; it ends with no dream, but a painful reality of Mrs. Eddy—in fact, it is tantamount to worship of Mrs. Eddy.

She is the "be-all and end-all" of so-called Christian Science, its only reality. Her officials are merely puppets, led by a string and in one fixed groove. There are no preachers, no talkers—only readers—some of the Bible, the others of Mrs. Eddy's works. These readers are appointed by her, and may not make a word or comment on what they read. They and the whole society of Christian Scientists may, according to a special by-law, be excommunicated one and all, unheard, merely because of a whim of "this setter-up and plucker-down" of creeds. All knowledge has not oozed out of Mrs. Eddy. She knows full well how to put herself on a pedestal, how to lure the admiration, love and loyalty of men and women whose truth and sincerity she has blinded to her sham, and how to call forth from fifty thousand non-Catholics a homage and devotion greater far than the homage and devotion that it shocks most Protestants to find us Catholics rendering to the pure and immaculate, lowly yet powerful Virgin Mother of God.

Note well how Mrs. Eddy speaks of herself. She is in direct communication with God. "No human pen or tongue taught me

²⁰ "Retrospection and Introspection," page 27.

the Science contained in this book, and neither pen nor tongue can ever overthrow it."²¹ She does not blush to make for her form of religion that promise of indefectibility which Christ made for His. Why? Because her book is inspired. "It was not myself, but the divine providence . . . which dictated 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures.'" "I should blush to write of 'Science and Health, etc.,' as I have, were it of human origin, and I, apart from God, its author."²² She hints that she is "the woman" who will crush the serpent's head,²³ and the woman whom St. John tells us of in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." In these words she finds "one distinctive feature which has special reference to the present age."²⁴ The "one distinctive feature" of Eddyism is Mrs. Eddy; in these words she finds Mrs. Eddy. Indeed, all the passages of Scripture that from the first centuries have been referred to our Lady, are now, after nineteen centuries of ignorance, found to pertain to this twentieth century Mary. She monopolizes the title Mother Mary, and fulminates a decree of excommunication against any one else who dares to take it. Even the angelic Ave and the beautiful Magnificat she misuses and mutilates. On May 20, 1890, she telegraphed to the National Christian Science Association that was assembled in New York these solemn words: "All hail! He hath filled the hungry with good things and the *sick* He has *not* sent away empty. Mother Mary." The real Mother Mary had said: "The *rich* hath He sent away empty." Mrs. Eddy mutilates the text, and her mutilation is received as inspired. The president of the association rises as its spokesman and places the false above the true Mother Mary, on a par with Jesus Himself. These are his words: "There *was* but one Moses, one Jesus; and there *is* but one Mary." He spoke not of the Mary that *was* with Jesus, but of the Mary that *is* without Jesus; and no one in that assembly wished or dared to contradict him.²⁵ No wonder! Has not their founder been blasphemous enough to claim to be equal with Jesus?²⁶ Does not she speak of herself as of "divine origin?" She says: "We shall claim no especial gift from our divine origin."²⁷

²¹ Page 4.

²² Cf. J. M. Buckley, in *North American Review*, vol. 173, page 24.

²³ Cf. "Unity of Good," page 57.

²⁴ Mark Twain, *North American Review*, December, 1902.

²⁵ Mark Twain, *North American Review*, April, 1903.

²⁶ Cf. *Christian Science Journal*, April, 1889; and Mark Twain, in *North American Review*, April, 1903.

²⁷ "Miscellaneous Writings," page 3.

We cannot, then, be surprised that some of her deluded votaries consider her the second Christ. Dr. George Tomkins says: "We consciously declare that 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures' was foretold, as well as its author, Mary Baker Eddy, in Revelation x. She is the 'mighty angel,' or God's brightest thought, to this age, giving us the spiritual interpretation of the Bible in the '*little book open.*' Thus we *prove* that Christian Science is the second coming of Christ."²⁸ This is a new meaning drawn from the words of St. John: "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven. . . . And he had in his hand a *little book open.*"²⁹ Another devotee is just as plain spoken in acknowledging that Mrs. Eddy is the Christ: "My prayer is daily to be more spiritual, that I may do more as you would have me do. . . . May we all love you more, and so live that the world may know that the Christ is come."³⁰ There are many Christian Scientists as deluded as these two. Mark Twain says he has it on good authority that at one time the Mother Church of Boston had a picture of Mrs. Eddy before which a votive lamp burned night and day; and in this church the mural fresco texts on one side were from the New Testament and were irreverently attributed to J. C., while the texts on the other side were from "Science and Health," and were magnanimously assigned to Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy. I have been told that even to-day the same church has a stained glass window which portrays no saint, but Mrs. Eddy.

We have tried to work out what it is Mrs. Eddy means. To this end we have read, pondered over and quoted from her writings and those of many who hang upon her every word. We can find in her so-called Christian Science nothing much of science and a "little little less-than-little" of Christianity. Her science is no new invention, but an indigestible rehash of the Idealism and Pantheism that gained much favor among unbelievers until the latter day Materialists marshaled their forces. Her Christianity is Eddyism—the substitution of Mrs. Eddy for Christ. We feel that our conclusion will be admitted by any one who reads the works of Mrs. Eddy "in a purely critical vein;" and that, to the man of thought and prudence, the mere disclosure of the tenets of so-called Christian Science is a refutation of the un-Christian blasphemies and unscientific vagaries that Mrs. Eddy has sent a-masquerading over the world under the holy and noble guise of Christianity and of science. There is as much Christianity and science hid behind the mask of Eddyism

²⁸ Cf. Mark Twain, in *North American Review*, January, 1903.

²⁹ Cf. Apocalypse, 10, 1 and 2.

³⁰ *Independent Statesman*, March 9, 1897.

as there is in the following jingling lines that Mrs. Eddy borrows from some unknown author and prefixes to her text-book:

"I, I, I, I itself, I,
The inside and outside, the what and the why,
The when and the where, the low and the high,
All I, I, I, I itself, I."

WALTER M. DRUM, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

LOUIS XIV. AND THE HOLY SEE.

1. *Histoire des désmeslez de la Cour de France avec la Cour de Rome au Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Bastia, publiés par L. X. P. Lucciana, 1888.*

2. *Deux documents inédits sur l'affaire des Corses à Rome, 20 Août, 1662. sujet de l'Affaire des Corses.*

Par M. l'Abbé Régner Desmarais. MDCCVII.

3. *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créqui, 1662-1665, par le Comte Charles de Moüy. Ancien Ambassadeur de France à Rome. Paris, 1893.*

4. *Louis XIV. et le Saint Siège, par Charles Gérin, Ancien Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. Paris, 1894.*

THE discourtesy towards Pius X. of which the President of the French Republic was guilty in his recent visit to Rome is not, perhaps, very surprising on the part of the head of a government which has always been hostile to Catholicity, and the majority of whose subjects are apparently indifferent to matters of religion; but it is, unfortunately, not the only occasion on which a Pope has been insulted in his capital by a ruler of France. Two of the most remarkable of these events occurred under the reign of Louis XIV., who, though priding himself on the title of Eldest Son of the Church, was led by his vanity to treat the Sovereign Pontiff with the same overbearing haughtiness and unscrupulous aggressiveness which he so often displayed in his dealings with other powers.

The pretext for the first of these invasions of the rights of the Holy See, which nearly plunged all Europe into a general war, was the attack made on the palace of the French Ambassador by the Corsican soldiers in the service of the Papal Government, infuriated by the insults they had received from members of the Ambassador's household, whose grooms and pages were noted as being still more turbulent than those of the other envoys accredited to the Vatican. The contempt which these troops of unruly followers openly displayed for the Papal authorities and the laws of the State was but the result of the feeling of impunity derived from the exorbitant privileges claimed by the Ambassadors, the most important of which was the right of asylum enjoyed not only by their palace, but also by all the surrounding houses, which became in consequence

the refuge of thieves and murderers and of every outlaw who sought to escape from justice. The Ambassadors insisted, moreover, on extending the same privilege to all those whom they authorized to place the arms of their sovereign over their doors, and they could even grant to a criminal a certificate that he belonged to their household and thereby preserve him from being arrested. As this protection was well paid for by those who received it, it formed a considerable source of revenue not only to the major-domo and the other servants of the Embassy, but sometimes even to the Envoy himself.

The Sovereign Pontiffs had protested repeatedly against these absurd and unjust pretentions, but at the death of each Pope his decrees and regulations seem to have passed away along with him, and his successor was under the obligation of again reënacting them. Thus in 1552 Julius III. had forbidden both the Roman nobles and the Ambassadors to usurp this right of granting an asylum to malefactors, which he denounced as a detestable abuse, and he declared that those who hindered the ministers of justice from entering their palace or from arresting criminals in the adjacent streets were guilty of high treason. This prohibition was renewed by Pius IV. in 1561, and Gregory XIII. in 1572, as well as Sixtus V. in 1585, reissued and confirmed these edicts. The well-known severity of the last named Pontiff seems to have checked the practice for some time, as no more decrees with regard to it appeared until the reign of Urban VIII., who, in 1626, repeated the previous denunciations with the addition of the punishment of death for all those who took refuge in the palace of a noble or of an Ambassador in order to escape from justice.

The evil, however, still persisted, and when, in the seventh year of the reign of Alexander VII. (1655-1677), during which space of time France had been represented in Rome only by Envoys of subordinate rank, Louis XIV. at last determined to send an Ambassador, the nobleman whom he selected came fully resolved to maintain this unjustifiable privilege and accompanied by a numerous retinue, composed of men who had served in the army and who were ready to seize on any occasion of creating a disturbance.

The courtier on whom the King's choice had fallen was Charles de Blanchefort de Bonne, Duc de Créqui and Prince de Poix, lieutenant general, first gentleman of the King's chamber and Knight of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He was more a soldier than a statesman, for he had commanded a corps of cavalry in Catalonia in 1645, and he had been wounded at the siege of Orbitello, in Tuscany, in 1646, while his diplomatic experiences merely consisted in a short mission to London in 1658 to congratulate Cromwell on the

victory won by the French and English troops over the Spaniards near Dunkirk, and to Spain in 1660 to bring the King's wedding presents to his future bride, Maria Teresa.

The Duke's contemporaries describe him as being a rough, haughty soldier, of an unyielding disposition, whose nomination to such an important post as that of Ambassador to Rome caused some surprise. The exaggerated idea which he entertained of his own importance and of the privileges to which he could lay claim was not diminished by the instructions which he received from the King, and the endless formalities of the extremely punctilious etiquette of the seventeenth century afforded him many occasions of offending the Papal Government. Thus, before leaving Paris for Rome, he refused to visit Mgr. Piccolomini, the Papal Nuncio, because it was not the custom for the Nuncio, while in his palace, to give the place of honor at his right hand to an Ambassador, and the Duke would have considered a place on the Nuncio's left hand as derogatory to his dignity. The Duke also demanded by the express orders of the King that, on his arrival in Rome, he should receive the visits of the Pope's brother, Don Mario Chigi, the Minister of War, and of his nephew, Don Agostino Chigi, Governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, instead of visiting them first—a pretension which was the origin of the bitter hostility which the Duke afterwards displayed towards the relations of the Sovereign Pontiff.

This point of precedence on which de Créqui pertinaciously insisted was not the only cause of the ill feeling which existed from the beginning of his embassy between the Holy See and Louis XIV. Another and a more dangerous source of discord was furnished by the King's desire to bring the States of Northern Italy under his influence, so as to counterbalance the power of Spain, which then possessed Milan and Naples, and two purely Italian questions, in which France had no right to interfere, gave him the opportunity he sought. The family of Farnese, which reigned at Parma, had many years previously mortgaged their Duchy of Castro and the town of Ronciglione, situated in the Papal States and held as a fief of the Holy See, but as they failed to pay the interest, Pope Urban VIII. had seized these estates in 1641, when the Camera Apostolica, or Papal Treasury, which became responsible for the debt, undertook to manage them and to satisfy the claims of the creditors. The lands were restored in 1642, and were again reoccupied by the Papal troops under Innocent X. in 1649, who allowed the Duke of Parma a delay of eight years to redeem them before they should be finally annexed. A further prolongation of this term for three years was granted by Alexander VII., but the Duke was still unable to pay, and Louis XIV., anxious to win him over

to his side, undertook to demand from the Holy Father the restitution of a property which the Papal Government had been fully justified in seizing.

The other matter in which the King of France had as little right to interfere was the claim put forward by the Duke of Modena to the town and lagoons of Comacchio, a dependency of the Duchy of Ferrara, which had also been held by the House of Este as a fief under the Holy See. On the death of Duke Alfonso II., in 1597, without direct heirs, Ferrara and Comacchio were incorporated with the Papal States by Clement VIII. as suzerain, while Modena was inherited by Cesar d'Este, Alphonso's illegitimate son, who, as well as his successors, persisted in laying claim to Comacchio as the property of his family.

The subordinate agents who, in the absence of an Ambassador, had since some years represented French interests in Rome, had always found the Sovereign Pontiff inflexible with regard to both of these questions, but Louis XIV. hoped that by means of a plenipotentiary of the rank of the Duke of Créqui he might at last persuade him to yield. The King reckoned also on the coöperation of the Spanish Government, which Cardinal Mazarin had sought to secure, by insisting on the insertion in the Peace of the Pyrenees (November 7, 1659) of two articles by which Spain was bound to support the King's demands; but Philip IV., who was not anxious to give any help to the ambitious projects of Louis XIV. with regard to Italy, found various pretexts for neglecting to perform his engagements, and the Dukes of Parma and Modena, who probably suspected what were the real motives of the zeal which their powerful protector manifested for their interests, did not show much alacrity in urging their claims.

The Ministers whom Louis XIV. had selected to assist him when, on the death of Cardinal Mazarin (March 9, 1661) he undertook the government of France as an absolute sovereign, and to whom he owed in a great measure the splendor of his reign, were Michel de Tellier, charged with the organization of the army; Jean Baptiste Colbert, as Minister of Finance, to which was afterwards added the administration of the navy, of the colonies, of the fine arts and of agriculture, and lastly, Hugues de Lionne as Secretary for Foreign Affairs. These statesmen, however, were, unfortunately, strongly imbued with Gallican principles, and to them must be attributed the spirit of hostility to Rome and the desire to humiliate the Holy See on every occasion which, according to Bossuet, was the policy which prevailed in the Council of Louis XIV.¹

As the King soon perceived that the order which he had given to

¹ Gérin, *Louis XIV. et la Saint Siège*, vol. i., p. 220.

the Duke de Créquy to demand that the Pope's nephews should visit him first was not likely to produce any other result than to render his Ambassador disagreeable to the Papal Court, he yielded at last and revoked it, but the Duke had already shown immediately after his arrival the spirit which animated him and with what jealous care he intended to maintain what he considered to be his privileges with regard to the right of asylum. A band of chained convicts on their way to the galleys was led one day by the police along the Via Giulia, which skirts the rear of the Palazzo Farnese, where the French Embassy was lodged, and shortly afterwards the police made a search in a house situated in the neighborhood. The Duke thereupon complained bitterly to the Papal Government of these encroachments on places under his jurisdiction, and when Mgr. Piccolomini, the Nuncio in Paris, sought to defend the evident right of the Sovereign Pontiff to cause the laws of the State to be executed in his capital, Hugues de Lionne replied insolently that Louis XIV. was the most susceptible Prince in the world, and the one whom it was most dangerous to offend, and that if he judged fit he could turn all Rome upside down.²

The Papal Government had already foreseen that the Duke de Créquy's household would probably cause some disturbance in the environs of his palace, and that more disorder might be expected on the arrival of Queen Christina of Sweden at the Palazzo Corsini, on the opposite bank of the Tiber, with an equally numerous and undisciplined crowd of attendants. The precaution was therefore taken of reinforcing the guard of Corsicans stationed close to the Church of La Trinità de Pellegrini, near the Ponte Sisto and the Palazzo Farnese, and it was raised to the number of 130 by drafts of picked men chosen from among the 800 Corsican soldiers then serving in various parts of the Papal States. The fact that Corsicans were at that time frequently employed in Italy to assist the *sbirri* or officers of justice when making an arrest or executing a sentence of the courts of law, may perhaps have been the reason why de Créquy's followers affected an insolent demeanor towards them whenever they met them and took pleasure in taunting them in the coarsest language with being merely spies of the police and not soldiers. More than once had the fiery Corsicans grasped their swords when insulted by the Ambassador's servants, who elbowed their way through them roughly as they stood talking together in front of their barracks; and, but for the timely intervention of their officers, they would have severely chastised their aggressors. In spite, however, of these incessant provocations, so great was the anxiety of the Papal authorities to avoid giving the foreign Amba-

² Regnier-Desmarais, p. 8.

sadors any cause of complaint, that the *shirri* and the guard of soldiers which patrolled Rome every night had strict orders not to use their arms. The only result of this rather timorous prudence was to encourage the French to commit further outrages. Thus on the night of July 23 four men belonging to a patrol of forty Corsicans which had halted on the Piazza de Fiori entered a wine shop in the adjoining Piazza Farnese. They found there several members of de Créqui's household, and among others a fencing master named Papillon, notorious for his quarrelsome disposition, who, "heated with wine and rendered insolent by the neighborhood of the Ambassador's palace,"¹³ attacked them, disarmed them, wounded two of them and brought their swords and muskets back to the Palazzo Farnese. De Créqui returned the arms on the following day and sent the fencing master secretly out of Rome; but the soldiers were warned by their officers that in the future they should defend themselves, and a report was even spread that Don Mario Chigi on meeting some Corsicans shortly afterwards asked them if they did not know how to make use of their arms, threatening at the same time to send them to the galleys if they again allowed themselves to be beaten.

It was while the Corsicans were still smarting under this humiliating defeat and the reproaches of their superiors that occurred the untoward event which nearly led to open warfare between Louis XIV. and the Holy See.

About 7 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday, August 20, three Corsican soldiers walking in the Via della Lungara on the side of the Tiber opposite the Palazzo Farnese met three Frenchmen wearing the Ambassador's livery, who insulted them with the usual opprobrious expressions, to which they merely replied: "We are not police spies, but soldiers of the Pope." Both parties then continued on their way, when the French suddenly turned and pursued the Corsicans sword in hand. The soldiers at once stopped, drew their weapons and drove their opponents back to the Ponte Sisto, where a crowd which had assembled separated them. The Frenchmen then crossing the bridge fell upon another Corsican and wounded him, but some more soldiers coming to his assistance made them fly towards the rear of the Palazzo Farnese, which is situated in the Via Giulia, and then returned to their quarters with their wounded comrade. The three Frenchmen apparently gave the alarm to the other grooms and footmen in the Ambassador's service, for about thirty of them, armed with pitchforks, swords and pistols, immediately rushed out of the palace in the direction of the bridge. On their way they met with two more Corsicans, one of whom escaped, while the other was driven into a shop and severely

wounded, but in the meanwhile news had reached the barracks that the Corsicans and the French had come to blows, that Corsican blood had been shed and that the French were coming to set fire to the barracks. The cry "to arms" was at once raised. The soldiers, anxious to avenge the insults which they had so long borne patiently, seized their muskets and dashed forward tumultuously, in spite of the efforts of the corporal of the guard to restrain them. Some of them even broke the bars of the gate, which he had closed, and forced their way through, leaving only about twenty men in the guard room. The captain of the company, who lodged in a neighboring street, hastened to the spot on hearing the uproar, and with the help of the lieutenant and sergeant succeeded in persuading the greater part of the soldiers to return to their quarters. About thirty or forty, however, still remained outside. Some of them wandered to and fro in the adjacent streets, where the terrified inhabitants had barricaded themselves in their houses, firing at random on any one whom they suspected of being French, while others opened fire on the Palazzo Farnese, and the Duke de Créqui, who came out on the *loggia* over the door, which still bears the trace of bullets, was in great danger of being killed. The Duchess de Créqui had been to visit the Church of San Bernardo at the Thermæ of Diocletian, and was returning, escorted by her pages and footmen, none of whom bore torches, but on hearing the shots she stopped her carriage at the corner of the Church of San Carlo di Catinari, and sent two footmen to inquire the cause of the disturbance. Some of the Corsicans fired upon them, but without touching them, whereupon the coachman immediately turned up a side street and drove to the palace of the Cardinal d'Este, but not before another shot had killed one of the pages. The mutiny was, however, soon at an end, for Don Mario Chigi took at once measures to restore order. Detachments of *sbirri* and of Italian and German troops were drawn up in the environs of the Palazzo Farnese, and the Cardinal d'Este, having armed his household, brought the Duchess back to her palace with a strong escort.

The Papal Government immediately sought to discover who were the perpetrators of this outrage against international law, as a result of which two persons had been wounded and eight shot dead or mortally wounded. A commission of Cardinals was named to decide what reparation should be offered to the King of France, and the police began to question the citizens who had witnessed the disturbance and the soldiers who had taken part in it. Some of the most guilty of the rioters had already escaped, but a price was put on their heads, and several were arrested in the Papal States or in Tuscany and lodged in the prisons of Rome.

The Duke de Créqui seems, however, to have come at once to the conclusion that this sudden outbreak of some hot-headed soldiers, exasperated by the provocation which they had received, was a premeditated outrage planned by the Ministers of the Pope, and especially by Don Mario Chigi, whom he had so long delayed to visit, and by Cardinal Imperiali, the Governor of Rome, who as head of the police was responsible for the arrests which had been made in the neighborhood of his palace. He therefore refused at first to see Cardinal Chigi, who wished to present to him the excuses of the Papal Government, and when he at last granted him an audience he received him coldly and informed him that the matter was no longer in his hands, but in those of the King. The Duke then, under pretext of defending himself against another attack, assembled 600 men in his palace in addition to the 200 who formed his household, laid in large stores of arms and ammunition and went through the city accompanied by a guard of 100 armed men. He was aided in these warlike preparations by Duke Cesarini, a Roman noble who was in the receipt of a pension from Louis XIV. and who wrote to the King offering to raise the people against the Pope, and pointing out to him that his estate at Ardea, in the Roman Campagna, would be a favorable situation for landing troops for the purpose of making an attack upon Rome.

The Papal Government requested de Créqui to disband his guards, but in vain; and as the citizens were much alarmed by this hostile garrison, which occupied such a strong position in their midst, and as several of the nobles, taking advantage of the general feeling of insecurity, began to arm their retainers, augmenting thereby the danger of further disturbances, more troops were brought into Rome and preparations were made for placing guard rooms near the French Embassy, while the Corsican soldiers were transferred to a distant part of the city. At last de Créqui, who was irritated by the slowness with which the inquiry into the outrage was being carried on, and who found that the other Ambassadors disapproved of his conduct, left Rome suddenly on September 1, without taking leave of the Holy Father, and went to reside at the town of San Quirico, in Tuscany.

From thence he wrote to the other Envoys in Rome stating that if the Sovereign Pontiff sincerely desired to offer satisfaction to the King he should, first, expel Cardinal Imperiali from the Sacred College; second, give Don Mario Chigi up to the King to do with him whatever he pleased; third, hang the captain, the lieutenant and the ensign of the Corsicans, together with fifty of their soldiers, on the Piazza Farnese; fourth, hang the bargello (or chief of the police) of Rome, with fifty of his *sbirri*, on the Piazza Navona, and fifth,

send a legate to France to offer an apology to the King in the name of the Holy See, and to declare that the Pope had had no share in the outrage and that he regretted that his Ministers should have been the cause of it.

It is only just to say that the demands which the King presented somewhat later were not so sanguinary as those of his Envoy; but the despatch in which the Duke informed His Majesty of the attack on the Embassy, and the expression of his conviction that it was made at the instigation of the relations of Alexander VII. and of Cardinal Imperiali, irritated the pride and the morbid vanity of Louis XIV. almost to madness. It also gave an additional stimulus to the animosity which his Ministers, and especially Hugues de Lionne, had always felt for the Holy See, and which is clearly shown in their correspondence regarding the mutiny of the Corsicans. The King, indeed, in a letter to de Créquy on October 13, 1662, was obliged to confess that he had then no proofs that the Cardinal had ordered the palace to be attacked, and that it would require much time to procure them, but still he asked that in the meanwhile the Cardinal should be imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo.

The first manifestation of the King's anger against Rome was the expulsion from Paris of Mgr. Piccolomini, the Papal Nuncio, who was ordered to withdraw to Meaux. He went instead to Saint Denis and then to a monastery at Gonesse, to each of which places he was followed by a guard of forty "*mousquetaires à cheval*," who watched him closely. He obtained, however, two audiences of de Lionne, in which he gave full explanations with regard to the outbreak of the Corsican soldiers, and before the second of these audiences took place, on September 9, at Suresnes, outside Paris, the King had received a letter from Alexander VII., in which the Holy Father expressed the grief which the attack on the Embassy had caused him, and Queen Christina of Sweden had written to de Lionne that the insolence of de Créquy's servants, not only towards the people, but also towards the Corsicans, was well known in Rome. She also assured him that the crime which the Corsicans had been driven to commit by these repeated insults had been neither instigated nor approved of by the Papal Government, and in a letter to Louis XIV., written at the same time, the Queen expressed the hope that he would not allow himself to be influenced and led astray by the passions or the interests of his Ministers. These assurances, however, had no effect either on the King or de Lionne, and it was in vain that Mgr. Piccolomini reminded the latter that the revolt had been immediately suppressed, the rioters imprisoned and steps taken to discover the guilty. He still remained, or pretended

to be, convinced that the Governor of Rome and the Pope's relations were responsible for the outrage.

The interview thus ended without producing any definite result, and two days afterwards the King, who showed great indignation on learning from de Créqui that he had left for Tuscany on account of more troops having been brought into Rome, ordered the Papal Nuncio to be expelled from France and to be conducted to the frontier of Savoy by a guard of soldiers.

The principal motive for the King's overbearing and insolent policy towards the Holy See was that he saw that he could find in this wholly unpremeditated outrage an opportunity of exciting public opinion against Rome, of humiliating the Papal Government and making it feel his power, and of forcing the Pope to grant him the concessions which he had hitherto vainly demanded—such as the restoration of Castro to the Duke of Parma, of Comacchio to the Duke of Modena and the right of nomination to three bishoprics situated in the provinces recently conquered from Spain. With the view, therefore, of making all necessary preparations in case he should think fit to declare war against the Holy See, Louis XIV. then began to treat with the King of Spain and the princes of Northern Italy in order to obtain leave for the passage of his troops through their States. It was a very embarrassing request. Its refusal might draw down upon them the vengeance of the most powerful sovereign in Europe, and if they acquiesced, they would not only be at war with the Pope and incur the censures of the Church, but might run the risk of losing their independence by the admission of French troops into Italy. Their resistance, however, did not last long. The King was far more powerful than the Pope; the danger of offending him was much greater, and every concession which he exacted was reluctantly made.

It would be tedious to enter into the details of the lengthy correspondence which took place between the King and the Holy See with regard to the satisfaction demanded for the attack on the Embassy. On the side of the King and his Ministers it consisted of a repetition of the same unjust and false accusations against the Pope and his relations of complicity in the outrage, for which no proof was forthcoming, and of threats intended to terrorize the Court of Rome and to constrain it to grant the King's demands. In reply to this insolent language the Papal Government could merely express its willingness to grant the King any reasonable satisfaction which he might require, while renewing the assurance that the outbreak of the Corsicans was wholly unpremeditated, and that it had been provoked by an aggression on the part of the French.

Finding that his threats produced no effect on the Papal Government, Louis XIV. proceeded to seize the town of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, a territory situated in Provence and belonging to the Holy See since three centuries. On September 30 the King's envoy, a cavalry officer, brought to Mgr. Lascaris, the Papal Vice Legate at Avignon, a peremptory order to dismiss his Italian troops, under pain of having the town invaded, alleging as a pretext that the Vice Legate had been fortifying the town and raising soldiers to increase the garrison; that he had allowed his subjects to speak disrespectfully of the King, and that he had impeded the free intercourse of the inhabitants of the State with their French neighbors. Mgr. Lascaris in reply pointed out that he could not disband his troops without orders from Rome, whereupon the partisans of France rose in rebellion and expelled them, tore down the Papal arms and replaced them by those of the King and besieged the Vice Legate in his palace. These outrages, it is true, were not approved of by Louis XIV., who did not wish to annex Avignon immediately, but merely to hasten the action of the Papal Court, and he therefore allowed the Vice Legate to remain still at Avignon and to govern in the name of the Pope.

The Papal Government had not as yet received any definite statement with regard to the conditions which the King would be likely to impose as satisfaction for the attack on the Embassy, and therefore hesitated to put forward any proposals; while on his side the King waited to see what he should be offered, in order to be able to exact further concessions, and he refused to take any notice of the three letters in which the Holy Father solemnly denied that his relations or his Ministers were in any way responsible for the crime of the Corsican soldiers.

At last, in the beginning of October, the Abbé Rospigliosi, nephew of the Cardinal of that name, who succeeded Alexander VII. in 1667 under the title of Clement IX., was sent to San Quirico to ascertain from the Duke de Créquy what terms he was instructed to demand, but as the Duke did not consider that the Papal Government had given its envoy sufficiently ample powers to treat, the abbé returned immediately to Rome.

He was replaced by Mgr. Rasponi, secretary to the Tribunal of the Consulta, a prelate with a high reputation for his sagacity, his tact and his disinterestedness. He was authorized to make the following concessions: The questions of Parma and Modena should be again examined; the guard rooms recently established near the Palazzo Farnese suppressed; Duke Cesarini was to be pardoned; the Corsicans should be forbidden by a Papal decree ever to serve the Holy See, and Cardinal Chigi should be sent to Paris as Legate

to offer an apology to the King. Before, however, stating these proposals, Mgr. Rasponi requested the Duke to state frankly what were the demands of the French Government, and the Duke then presented to him two sets of conditions, already drawn up by de Lionne, between which the Court of Rome was to choose. By the first it was required that Castro should be restored to the Duke of Parma and Comacchio to the Duke of Modena; that the privileges enjoyed by the Ambassadors should not be abolished without the consent of all the Cardinals; that the proceedings against Duke Cesarini should be stopped, and an indemnity granted to him; that the guards established in Rome since August 20 should be withdrawn, and an agreement made with the Duke de Créqui as to the ceremonies which should take place on his return to Rome. The alternate was that Don Mario Chigi should be banished to Sienna for six years; that Cardinal Chigi should come to Paris to offer an apology in the name of the Pope, and demand pardon for himself and all his family; that Cardinal Imperiali should be tried and expelled from the Sacred College; the bargello, or chief of the police of Rome, dismissed and banished, and that in commemoration of the outrage an obelisk should be erected in Rome with an inscription declaring that the Corsican nation was unworthy of ever bearing arms in the Papal service. Then followed articles referring to the proceedings against Duke Cesarini and all persons who had been prosecuted since August 20 for carrying arms; to the suppression of the guard rooms, and to the reception of de Créqui, as in the former series.

Even the King confessed, when forwarding these demands to his envoy, that it would be difficult to make them be accepted, and he added that even then there were many other concessions and favors, such as bishoprics and benefices for certain of his partisans, which he had often solicited without success, and which should be granted before anything was concluded.

Mgr. Rasponi, however, refused to concede more than what was contained in his instructions, and after several days of discussion the negotiations had made no progress. The Pope, indeed, and the Sacred College, to which in a consistory held on October 30 he had made known what he justly termed "the iniquitous demands" of Louis XIV., were willing to send Cardinal Chigi to Paris to enlighten the King as to the events which had taken place in Rome, but the Holy Father refused to give up Castro or Comacchio, as he considered himself bound by the decisions of his predecessors. He consented also to dismiss the bargello and to publish a Brief against the Corsicans, but he refused to sacrifice Cardinal Imperiali to the resentment of the King, as he knew him to be innocent.

By the advice, however, of the Council of State, Cardinal Imperiali, in order that he might not have to meet the Duke on his return, was given instead of the Governorship of Rome that of the Province of the Marches, a dignity which he resigned on the following day.

On being informed of this nomination, which he chose to consider as a fresh outrage against his sovereign, de Créqui wrote to the other Ambassadors that His Majesty was resolved to be revenged on Don Mario Chigi and Cardinal Imperiali, whom he looked upon as the enemies of his reputation and his glory, in such a way that the memory of it should serve as an example to posterity. He protested, however, that the King was ready to shed his blood for the Holy See, but that he made a distinction between the Pope and his relations and Ministers, who were seeking to shelter themselves under the cover of his authority. The Duke then broke off the negotiations, left San Quirico, and after a short stay at Sienna and Florence arrived at Leghorn on November 25 to embark for France.

The dread which the other Catholic States of Europe entertained of being drawn into a long and disastrous war with France rendered Louis XIV. assured of their neutrality and even of their complicity in the campaign which he was preparing against the Holy Father. It is true that Philip IV. of Spain protested strongly against a conflict which he foresaw would give great satisfaction to the French Huguenots, and refused to seize the Province of Beneventum, a possession of the Church situated in the Kingdom of Naples, but he yielded so far to the threats of Louis XIV. that he consented to allow the French troops to pass through the territory of Milan, while refusing the same permission to the soldiers levied for the Papal service in Germany and Switzerland.

The same weakness was shown by the Italian States, which gave way almost without resistance to the imperious demands of the King. The Republic of Venice, which Alexander VII., like so many of his predecessors, had so often assisted with men and money in its wars against the Turks, promised to furnish provisions to the French troops, and the Duke of Savoy agreed to allow them a free passage through his States. So did the Grand Duke of Tuscany, though he begged to be excused from entering into any alliance against the Holy Father; but the Republic of Genoa carried its servility to the King so far as to allow itself to be made the instrument of his vengeance against Cardinal Imperiali.

The Cardinal, hoping that his disappearance from public life might appease the King's irritation against the Sovereign Pontiff, had withdrawn to Genoa, where his family occupied a distinguished position; but the French Envoy, M. d'Aubeville, having been in-

structed to ask if the Republic intended to take the Cardinal under its protection, the Senate gave orders for his immediate expulsion. The Cardinal, in disguise and followed by two servants, escaped at night from the soldiers sent to seize him, and hid himself in the neighborhood of Genoa. Driven again from thence, he fled by sea to Lerici, where he was nearly shipwrecked, and after many wanderings he found at last a refuge in a monastery in the Duchy of Massa and Carrara.

The departure of the Duke de Créqui had put a stop to the diplomatic relations between Rome and France, but Alexander VII., in his desire to bring the misunderstanding to an end, sought the intervention of the Venetian Ambassador in Paris, Aloise Grimani, and of Michael Iturietta, the secretary in charge of the Spanish Embassy. The Holy Father requested these diplomatists to present a letter to the King, in which he declared that he had refused no concession which could be granted without offending God or injuring the Holy See, and he expressed a desire to renew the negotiations at any place which the King might select. Louis refused to accept this letter, but he had been informed by persons in his pay in Rome that, in case there should be no other means of reopening the negotiations the Pope was willing to allow the questions of Castro and Comacchio to be brought forward and discussed. This decision on the part of Alexander VII. had been communicated at his request to Grimani and Iturietta by the Spanish and Venetian Ambassadors at the Vatican, but with strict orders not to reveal it unless they discovered that the King was resolved to return to the subject, when they might say that His Holiness was willing to give any suitable satisfaction, but without engaging the Pope in the matter decisively or compromising Venice and Spain. The King and his Ministers sought, therefore, to obtain from Grimani and Iturietta by threats of an immediate invasion of Italy a written document which might seem to proceed directly from the Pope and constrain him to allow these questions to be treated, while, if he disallowed the act of his representatives, he could be accused of dishonesty and faithlessness. Grimani and Iturietta did not suspect the snare which had been laid for them, and it was only after a long resistance and repeated assurances on the part of the French Government that its troops were about to enter Italy, that they consented to give in writing the declaration which was demanded of them.

Though the Sovereign Pontiff might well have found fault with the methods employed to oblige Grimani and Iturietta to give this promise, he confirmed it without hesitation. Mgr. Rasponi was again chosen as plenipotentiary, and in his credentials, dated March

23, 1663, it was stated that he was sent in consequence of the assurance given by Grimani and Iturietta that suitable satisfaction would be given with regard to the questions of Castro and Comacchio, and that the Pope, who had always desired what was equitable and becoming, would willingly concede whatsoever justice should require to be yielded and the guidance of an upright conscience would allow him to grant. De Créquì's instructions, on the other hand, ordered him to discuss last the most important question of all—namely, that of Castro; so that, in the words of de Lionne, the King might be at liberty to agree to the terms at any given moment or not, according as it suited his interests, and that when the other sovereigns of Europe learned that all the preceding demands had been agreed to, they would insist that the Court of Rome should yield also with regard to Castro.

The Duke de Créquì did not arrive at Lyons, where Mgr. Rasponi had already preceded him, until May 10, but after a few interviews the negotiations were suspended by order of the King, who objected to the title of Nuncio given to Mgr. Rasponi, as he was resolved not to receive a Nuncio in his kingdom until his demands had been fully satisfied; and he informed the Duke that it was his intention to treat the Court of Rome with harshness on every occasion and to mortify it in every way. His Majesty, therefore, decreed that the Papal Envoy should be expelled from France and go to reside at Pont-de-Beauvoisin, a village in Savoy close to the frontier, on the French side of which the Duke de Créquì took up his abode. The renewed discussion did not last very long, for when the question of Castro came to be treated, as the Duchy had been legally forfeited to the Holy See by the neglect of the Duke of Parma to pay his creditors, and as the Pope considered himself bound by oath not to alienate the property of the Church, Mgr. Rasponi could only consent in his name to submit the matter to the Tribunal of the Rota or to a congregation of Cardinals. On referring to Rome his decision was confirmed, and the conference was brought to an end on July 1, M. de Créquì threatening that when the King invaded Italy he would demand still greater concessions, and as soon as Louis XIV. was informed of the non-success of the negotiations he made every preparation for the invasion of the Papal States.

He began by sending an advance guard of 1,500 infantry and 2,400 cavalry into the Duchies of Parma, Modena and Montferrat; and to justify this step he had the dishonesty to inform the Spanish Government that he considered himself bound to protect his allies from an incursion of the Papal army, though the Duke of Parma and the Duchess Regent of Modena had protested that they were

in no want of protection, since they apprehended no danger from Rome, and they added that as that year's harvest had been bad, the maintenance of a body of foreign troops would impose a serious burden on their subjects. The King, however, insisted, promising to furnish provisions for his soldiers and the rulers of the Duchies were obliged to submit. This anxiety for the welfare and independence of Parma and Modena can be well explained by the fact that in the previous month of February the King had caused the Duke of Parma to be informed that in case he succeeded in obtaining the restoration of the Duchy of Castro he hoped that the Duke would solemnly promise to devote himself forever to his interests and to conform in everything to his will.

Louis then completed the annexation of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, by ordering the Parliament of Provence to draw up a decree to that effect, which M. d'Oppède, the first President of that assembly, presented to the Vice Legate on July 7. On the refusal of Mgr. Lascaris to consent to this unjust seizure of the territory of the Holy See, he was expelled from Avignon and escorted by soldiers to Nice in the States of the Duke of Savoy.

The advanced guards of the French army were soon quartered in the Italian Duchies, in spite of the ill will of the sovereigns and of the people, which the latter manifested by frequent assassinations of French soldiers; and towards the end of December the number of troops which were to form the expedition was fixed at 26,000 infantry, 7,000 cavalry and 16 guns. At the same time, however, the King consented to allow the Abbé de Bourlamont, auditor of the Tribunal of the Rota and one of the secretaries of the French Embassy in Rome, to renew the negotiations on the condition that if they were not concluded by February 15 the Papal States should be invaded. It was in vain that the Sovereign Pontiff appealed for help to the Emperor of Germany, the King of Spain and the various States of Italy. The Emperor was scarcely able to defend Germany from the repeated onslaughts of the Turks; Spain, weakened by the recent war with France, was engaged in a disastrous struggle with Portugal, which Louis, in spite of the stipulations of the Treaty of the Pyrenees, was secretly helping with men and money; and the Italian princes were powerless in presence of the overwhelming military superiority of France. The Holy Father, therefore, after having consulted the College of Cardinals, again despatched Mgr. Rasponi to represent him in the renewed negotiations. They took place at Pisa, and there on February 12, 1664, was concluded a treaty of which the following were the principal articles: The Duchy of Castro was to be given up by the Papal Treasury and the Duke of Parma allowed a further delay of eight

years to pay off the charges; the Duke of Modena was to receive an indemnity for the Lagoons of Comacchio; Cardinal Chigi was to go to France to make a humble apology to the King, while his father, Don Mario, should give his word of honor that he was not responsible for the outrage of August 20, and Cardinal Imperiali should appear before the King to justify himself. The bargello of Rome was to be banished; the entire Corsican nation declared unworthy of ever serving the Holy See, and an obelisk bearing an inscription to that effect erected opposite their barracks. The King in return promised to restore Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin to the Pope, who, on his side, consented to grant an amnesty to the persons who had revolted at the time of the annexation, as well as to annul all proceedings against Duke Cesarini and some other Roman nobles, and to compensate the Duke for whatever losses he might have sustained.

Such were the humiliating conditions which the pride and ambition of Louis XIV. imposed on Alexander VII., who, on February 18, deposited in the Archives of the Vatican an eloquent protest against the violence to which he had been subjected. After stating that the questions of Castro and Comacchio had nothing to do with the attack on the Embassy, the Pope recalled the threats by which the King had sought to intimidate him; the seizure of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, whose inhabitants had been encouraged to rebel, and the occupation of the Duchies of Parma and Modena by the advanced guard of the army which was to invade the Papal States. The Holy Father then mentioned the vain efforts he had made to obtain help from the Emperor, the King of Spain and the Italian Princes, and he declared that if he had yielded it was simply in order to avoid the misfortunes which a war against so powerful a sovereign as the King of France would have brought upon Italy at a time, especially, when Christendom was in the utmost danger from the Turks, who had invaded Candia, who were threatening Dalmatia and Friuli, and who were about to begin another campaign against Hungary.

The Court of Rome performed faithfully the conditions imposed upon it. The Corsican soldiers were disbanded and sent home, and though the Papal Government requested the King to be satisfied with the commemoration of the outrage by means of a slab affixed to the wall of the Palazzo Farnese, His Majesty insisted on the construction of a solidly built obelisk guarded by a railing in front of the Corsican barracks, and bearing an inscription stating that in execration of the odious crime committed by the Corsican soldiers against the Ambassador of the most Christian King, the Corsican nation had been declared by a decree of Pope Alexander

VII. incapable of serving the Apostolic See. It is true that in 1668, under the reign of Clement IX., the King consented to allow this monument to be destroyed, but its memory must have been recalled to the minds both of the French and the Romans, when, less than a century and a half later, a Pope assisted at the installation of a Corsican soldier on the throne of the Bourbons.

Cardinal Chigi came to France, as it had been stipulated, and was received by the French people with enthusiasm, and by the King at Fontainebleau with the splendor and ceremony which distinguished the French Court; but the Parliament of Paris, well known for its Gallican opinions, raised many objections to his reception in Paris, to which at last it had to consent, and His Eminence found that during his journey through France his correspondence with Rome was intercepted and his letters opened.

Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, the people of which had been given to understand that they were definitively annexed to France, were restored to the Holy See, and Louis, who, for the furtherance of his unscrupulous policy, had driven them to revolt, was now obliged to revoke the decree of the Parliament of Provence and reinstate the Vice Legate and the Papal garrison. But in order to manifest as much ill will as possible, while apparently conforming to the Treaty of Pisa, the King refused to permit the construction of a citadel at Avignon which could control the town, and he would not even allow the Vice Legate to fortify his palace so as to enable it to withstand a popular outbreak.

The Duke de Créqui came back to Rome as Ambassador, and the King kept him there for some time; but after the events which had taken place he could not hope to be treated by the Vatican otherwise than with coldness and mistrust, and the Pope when transacting any business with the Court of France, preferred to ignore his presence in Rome and to employ the Papal Nuncio in Paris as his intermediary. The Duke was at last recalled at his urgent and often repeated request, and with his departure, on April 24, 1665, the humiliation and insults inflicted by Louis XIV. on the Sovereign Pontiff in revenge for the unpremeditated attack on the French Embassy were brought to an end.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

THE "HIGHER CRITICISM."

THE science of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible, which is a help to believers in Holy Writ, has been used as a weapon of destruction by unbelievers in Divine revelation. Catholics firmly hold that all the parts of the books of Holy Scripture have been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and they accept them on the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, "which is the pillar and ground of truth;" whereas Protestants depend for their belief in the Sacred Books on historical arguments and on ancient tradition. The many Rationalists of to-day, who hold neither to the authority of a church or to tradition, look on the Sacred Scriptures as merely human documents, and criticize them freely by means of modern scientific methods. The arch-rationalist Renan when writing about the Bible declared that until a new order of things prevailed he would hold the principle of historical criticism that a supernatural account cannot be allowed, as it always implies credulity or fraud, and that the duty of the historian is to seek to find out what amount of truth or falsehood it may contain. He and his German fellow-unbelievers do not allow the Sacred Scriptures to be a truthful historical record or to be the inspired Word of God, and they have devoted their extensive learning and their time to a searching critical inquiry into the nature, the origin and the truthfulness of the Old and New Testaments. They have loudly proclaimed to the world that many of the historical statements of the Bible are unfounded and are purely mythical, and that the Sacred Book is full of historical mis-statements and contradictions. The same spirit of skepticism which had rejected the early history of Greece and Rome now sought to show that the Sacred Writings were only a confused collection of fabulous legends. When a new world was discovered through the unwearied labors of archæologists and the inscriptions on the monuments of the ancient Eastern empires of Assyria, Babylon and Egypt were one by one deciphered, and men stood face to face with the contemporaneous records of the times of Abraham and Moses, then their joy was unbounded at the utter destruction, as they fondly hoped, of the Bible myths by the brilliant light that thus was suddenly thrown upon them through the finding of those long-buried treasures of Eastern history. But happily the newly-discovered heathen records have corroborated in a wonderful way the truthfulness of the Holy Scriptures, and archæology has undone the work of those apostles of the "Higher Criticism."

The arrogance of the tone of those scientific skeptics indeed had already aroused distrust amongst scholars whose minds were not swayed by hatred of divine revelation, and their unfounded theories now crumbled into dust before these newly-discovered records of the past in the Babylonian libraries and the Egyptian tombs and temples. A more cautious, impartial and logical spirit has taken the place of scientific skepticism, and when the spade of Schliemann had brought to light the long-buried Empire of Agamemnon it became evident to every one that the higher critics were at fault, and that their destructive arguments were little better than sophisms, which had for their foundation only "a little learning." The reconstruction of early Greek and Roman history was followed shortly afterwards by the discovery of the ancient history of the East; and then, to the dismay of the "higher critics," it was clearly seen that the truth of the Bible history was upheld by the new discoveries of the Eastern archæologists.

As soon as the cuneiform inscriptions which were engraved in the Persian, Scythian and Babylonian languages on the sacred rock of Behistun were deciphered by the patient skill of German, French and English archæologists, the key was obtained for unlocking the treasures of historical knowledge which were hidden hitherto in the ancient monuments of the East, and then a deadly blow was struck at the higher critics of the Bible; for the historical statements made by those Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions were found to be in full agreement with the Bible narrative. And when the hieroglyphic writings on the ancient Egyptian monuments were rightly interpreted through means of the deciphered inscriptions on the Rosetta stone, which had both Greek and Egyptian characters inscribed upon it, a flood of light was thrown upon the truthfulness of the sacred books.

Much of the criticism that has been lavished in such great abundance on the sacred writings was founded on the assumption that the ancient Oriental world was inferior in civilization and culture to the modern world of Europe. The higher critics took it for granted that no literature existed in those early times in the East; that the art of writing was almost wholly unknown, and that every statement which implied the existence of civilization should be put aside as mythical and legendary. The story of the marching of great Babylonian and Assyrian armies into far-off Palestine was declared to be a foolish fable, as such great undertakings were impossible from the want of highways and the means of transporting such large numbers of men through wild and savage wastes; and thus it came to pass that the authenticity and the truthfulness of the Sacred Scriptures were treated with contempt and laughed to

scorn. But we know now from the contemporaneous records of the ancient monuments that have been unearthed, with patient labor, from the mounds, which alone remain of the splendid cities of Babylon, Persia and Assyria, that such events took place in the days of the Jewish patriarchs and prophets, and that the ancient Eastern world enjoyed a very high degree of civilization and of literary culture.

We can now see with our own eyes, through the excavations that have been made in many parts of Greece, Cyprus and Asia Minor that the dim tradition of a cultured age at Mycenæ and at Troy was founded on fact, and we can trace the intercourse of the highly civilized Grecian races with the North and the East, with the Egyptians and the Phœnicians. We also learn that the heroic age of Greece was an age of civilization and of culture. We know, too, from the lately discovered inscriptions and cuneiform tablets at Tel-el-Amana, on the banks of the river Nile, that the peoples of Western Asia at the time of Moses were as highly cultured as the Greeks and the Romans were when their prosperity was at its highest.

The iconoclasm of the critical school of historians had done its worst when the pages of history which had seemed to be lost forever were restored, the veil was lifted which had concealed for so many centuries the records of the past, and the explorer and decipherer gave us back the ancient documents of the great empires of the East. Twenty years ago we possessed only scraps and fragments of ancient history, and the Bible alone gave a full account of those olden times; but, as it stood alone, it was looked upon by scientific historians as legendary and untrustworthy. The libraries of Babylon and Assyria, however, have been discovered, and we have learned at length that the Eastern nations then were as civilized and as cultured as the world of to-day, and that the arrogant assumptions of the critical historians were founded mostly on imperfect evidence and on ignorance of ancient history.

A dead world has come to life through the spade of the excavator and the patient labor of the decipherer; and through the finding of the monuments of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria we find ourselves face to face with Sargon, Sennacherib, Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus, and we can follow the march of their victorious armies. These wonderful discoveries have thrown a flood of light on the ancient world of the East, and have in a wonderful way corroborated and elucidated the Bible narrative.

A few examples will show how these lately discovered monuments of past ages coincide with Bible history, and serve to overthrow the skeptical teaching of the apostles of the "Higher Criticism."

It is stated in the Book of Genesis that Abram the Hebrew, who dwelt in the vale of Mambre, having by a night attack defeated Chordorlahomor and his army in the vale of Save, "Melchisedech, the King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him and said: Blessed be Abram by the most high God who created heaven and earth" (ch. xiv.).

The higher critics declared that this story of the priest-king of Salem, standing alone and unsupported by any document of antiquity, was unhistorical and altogether unworthy of credence. An account of a priest-king of Salem has been discovered, however, on the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt, and his resemblance to Melchisedech, the King of Salem and priest of the most high God, whom the critics considered to be a purely mythological personage, is so great that, although he lived in later times, the plea of historical and archæological impossibility falls to the ground. A tablet was discovered a few years ago at Tel-el-Amarna on which was inscribed a letter from Ebed-tob, the vassal King of Salem (Jerusalem), to his lord and King Pharaoh of Egypt. He writes: "Behold neither my father nor my mother have exalted me in this place; the arm of the Mighty King has caused me to enter the house of my father. Behold I am an ally of the King, and I have paid the tribute, even I. Neither my father nor my mother, but the arm of the Mighty King established in the father's house." We learn thus from an inscribed document that is older than the Book of Exodus that the history of the meeting of the Patriarch Abraham and the priest-king of the sacred city of Salem—the city of peace—was in the fullest accordance with the circumstances of the time and country.

The protagonists of the Higher Criticism of the Bible, having found out that a word which is of much later date than the time of Solomon is used in the Canticle of Canticles (Song of Songs), held therefore that this beautiful poem was a forgery of later times. But a small hæmatite weight was discovered lately at the site of the ancient city of Samaria, on which are inscribed characters of the eighth century before Christ, and amongst them occurs this word, "Shel." The critics at first denied the genuineness of the inscription, and then the reading of it; but at length they wisely sought refuge in silence.

The Prophet Isaias warned the Jews that a visitation should come upon them from afar; that they should be bound down under the bond and be slain, and that the Assyrian would be the rod and staff of the wrath of God; but he consoled them with the promise that when the Lord should have performed all His works in Mount

Sion and in Jerusalem, He would set His hand to possess the remnant of His people which should be left from the Assyrians and from Egypt, and would set up a standard unto the nations and gather together the fugitives of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Israel from the four quarters of the earth. Catholic commentators on Holy Scripture have been puzzled by this passage of the Book of *Isaias*. Knabenbauer in his learned book on the prophecies of *Isaias* writes: "What is the meaning of this description of the Assyrian invasion? Is it a true prophecy or a mere poetic fable, as recent writers affirm it to be?" and he answers that this prophecy was a vision, which though literally or symbolically true for the most part, must not be taken as a correct historical description of what really happened when the armies of Sennacherib poured down their destructive torrent on the fertile plains of Palestine. Modern scientific historians scoff at the whole of the tenth and eleventh chapters of the Book of *Isaias*, where the prophecy of the Assyrian invasion is given, and they declare that the events predicted by the prophet never took place and are wholly destitute of any historical foundation. We know now from the many Assyrian monuments that have been brought to light in recent years that whilst the inspired prophet was announcing those awful woes to the sinful Jews the army of an Assyrian King was marching from the north upon Jerusalem; that the sacred city was sacked and burned, and that the noblest citizens, with their wives and families, were dragged into captivity, a remnant alone remaining. The history of this Syrian invasion has been found in the libraries of Babylon, and the history of the Egyptian invasion which *Isaias* had prophesied at the same time has been found written in hieroglyphics on the walls of the ruined temple of Karnak, where the Egyptian King is pictured as striking down with a colossal club the conquered Hebrews. The contemporaneous cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon and Nineveh tell us that Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, invaded Judea and captured Jerusalem; and the truthfulness and trustworthiness of the inspired prophet has been fully vindicated. The Assyrian King Sargon had many inscriptions giving the history of his warlike deeds engraven on the walls of his palace near Nineveh, and we learn from them that whilst fighting himself against the King of Babylon his commander-in-chief invaded Judea, took Samaria and Jerusalem, made captives the mighty of the land and men fit for war, leaving the peasants to till the soil and pay tribute to the Assyrian monarch. He made a treaty of peace with Pharaoh, King of Egypt, and with Samsé, Queen of the Arabs, and described himself proudly on his monuments as "The conqueror of the widespreading plains of Judea." He then was

solemnly enthroned at Babylon as the adopted son of Bel and the successor of the ancient Babylonian Kings. Having been murdered the following year, his son Sennacherib succeeded to his mighty throne. Those Scripture interpreters who had been forced unwillingly to look upon the Assyrian invasion mentioned by Isaia as "ideal," have learned now from Assyrian and Babylonian monuments that it was a reality, and the scientific critics of the Bible have seen another weapon against the sacred writings broken in their hands.

The Holy Scriptures often speak of the ancient kingdom of the Hethites (or Hittites). The Canaanite who betrayed his fellow-citizens to the Israelites dared not stay in his native land, but fled away "into the land of Hethim" (Judges i., 26). Solomon bought horses from "Egypt and Coa and from all the Kings of the Hethites" (III. Kings x., 28), and when God sent a panic amongst the Syrian army as it lay encamped before the city of Samaria "they said one to another: Behold the King of Israel has hired the Kings of the Hethites against us" (IV. Kings vii., 6). This great Hethite nation is mentioned also in other parts of the Holy Scriptures.

The apostles of the "Higher Criticism," however, asserted that the Hittite nation never existed in the East, since no record of them has come to us, and they considered the frequent mention of them in the writings of the Old Testament to be a strong proof of the unhistorical and mythical character of the sacred books. But numerous records of that powerful nation have been discovered in many place of Asia Minor and at Babylon within the last few years, and through the unwearied labors of indefatigable explorers we have learned about the intercourse which was carried on between the princes of Greece and the Egyptian, Phœnician and Hittite nations. Modern excavations and the successful deciphering of cuneiform and hieroglyphic inscriptions has brought to light again this ancient race which was most powerful at one time in the East. The reasonings of the critics have come to naught, for the stones cry out against them.

We have learned from the Egyptian inscriptions at Tel-el-Amarna and elsewhere that the Kings of Egypt had fierce struggles with the Hittite nation and that Ramses II., who is thought to be the Pharaoh who oppressed the Jews, was glad to make peace with them; that peace was ratified by the marriage of the daughter of the Hittite King with the Egyptian monarch, and the terms of the treaty of peace, which still exists engraven on stone, make known to us the greatness of the Hittite kingdom. "The King was in the city of Ramses on that day. Then came forward the ambassador of

the King and presented the ambassadors of the great King of the Hittites who were sent to propose friendship to the King Ramessu Mi-Aman, the dispenser of life eternally." The terms of the treaty, which were written on a silver tablet, are then given at great length on the Egyptian's monument.

The Hittite nation, which existed before the exodus of the Jews from Egypt, grew little by little until it became one of the most powerful nations of the East. It carried its arms, its art and its religion to the shores of the Ægean Sea, and as Professor Sayce writes, the early civilization of Greece and Rome owes much to it. The Hittite kingdom stretched at one time from Carchemish, on the river Euphrates, to Kadesh, on the Orontes, near the Mediterranean Ocean, and it continued until the invasion of Asia Minor and Judea by the armies of the Assyrian King Rammon-nirari III. This great King recounts his warlike achievements on his monuments in this wise: "As far as the shores of the great sea at the rising of the sun, from the banks of the Euphrates, the land of the Hittites, the land of the Amorites to its farthest bounds, the land of Tyre, the land of Sidon, the land of Nuri, the land of Edom, the land of the Philistines as far as the shores of the great sea at the setting of the sun, I subjected to my yoke, tribute and gifts I imposed upon them." The Hittite nation gradually grew weak and became a prey to the neighboring nations and for many thousands of years their name and fame were known only through the Bible records; but this great nation which had played so important a part in the history of the Eastern world has been made known to us now by the lately discovered monuments of the East.

An amusing example is given in the interesting book on "Ants and Bees" by Sir John Lubbock, which shows how ignorant and narrow-minded are some of the skeptical professors of the "Higher Criticism." Those learned men unanimously held at one time that the statement which is made by King Solomon in the Book of Proverbs that "the ant provideth her meat for herself in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest," was contrary to fact, since it had been observed repeatedly by most careful scientists that ants do not hoard up grain or any other food for future use. This statement of those learned opponents of the Bible is true undoubtedly of the ants that live and thrive in the northern countries of Europe, for there they never store up food of any kind during the time of harvest, but "it is now," as Sir John Lubbock asserts, "a well-established fact that more than one species of southern ants do collect seeds of various sorts." The statement of King Solomon has been verified and confirmed since by travelers in the East. "Sykes in his account of an Indian ant appears to have been the

first of modern authors to confirm the statements of Solomon. He states that the above-named species collects large stores of grass seeds, on which it subsists from February to October. On one occasion he even observed ants bringing up their stores of grain to dry them after the closing thunderstorms of the monsoons. It is now known that harvesting ants occur in the warmer parts of Europe, where their habits have been observed with care." It is evident, therefore, that Solomon was right, and that the Bible critics were wrong in this matter, as they were in very many other Scriptural questions wherein they spoke contemptuously of the narrative of the sacred writers.

The heathen records of the past that have been discovered of late years beneath the mounds of Babylon and Nineveh, on the clay tablets of the buried city of Kowyunjik and on the ancient monuments of Egypt and Cyprus have been found to agree with and to corroborate in a wonderful way the historical statements of the sacred writers. "Who would have believed it probable or possible," writes Layard, "before these discoveries were made, that beneath the heap of earth and rubbish which marked the site of Nineveh, there would be found the history of the wars between Hezekiah and Sennacherib, written at the very time when they took place by Sennacherib himself, and confirming, even in minute details, the Biblical record? He who would have ventured to predict such a discovery would have been treated as a dreamer or an imposter."

The Bible, as a great scientific scholar said, coming as it does from the hand of God, awaits securely the progress of knowledge. It watches with unconcern the unearthing of the lore of a buried world, and it rejoices with every inscribed stone and storied cylinder that is discovered amongst the ruins of ancient cities. It hails as so many witnesses to its truthfulness every deciphered monument and hieroglyphic slab. It fears not the light, but only the darkness of ignorance, and it calmly abides the fulfilment of the predictions which divine inspiration has written on its sacred pages. If men of science were also filled with the spiritual gifts of wisdom and holiness, both learning and religion would profit alike.

ALBERT BARRY, C. SS. R.

TIBETAN BUDDHISM AND CATHOLICITY.

RECENT travel in Central Asia has shown among other things that the statistics of the religions of the far East require considerable revision. The number of Buddhists, for example, has been grossly exaggerated, and the popular error that Buddhism is the religion of China is very difficult to uproot.

M. Grénard, whose recently translated book on "Tibet and the Tibetans"¹ is one of the most valuable and scientific works on that strange country which has yet been published, says he knows only two nations whose national religion is Buddhism, viz., Mongolia and Tibet; and the combined population of these two countries does not amount to more than six millions. There are, of course, a good many Buddhists in China and in India, but Buddhism is not the national religion of either of these countries. Confucianism is by far the most predominant of the three religions of China, Taoism, or demon worship, and Buddhism being the other two, and according to Mrs. Bishop (Isabella Bird) they are so mixed up with each other that there is little antagonism between them, but Confucianism remains the strongest religious force in the Celestial Empire, while Brahminism is the religion of nine-tenths of the Hindoo population, cradle though India be of Buddhism.

At present Tibet is as much the stronghold, the centre, the home of Buddhism as the Eternal City is of Christianity; but Lamaism, or Tibetan Buddhism is, as M. Grénard explains, a very different religion from that founded in India by Sakya-muni, the Light of Asia. Catholicism and the most extreme Protestant sects are not wider apart than the original Buddhism of the Enlightened One and Lamaism. Buddhism as taught by Sakya-muni was too elevated, too spiritual for the Tibetans; for pure Buddhism is a religion only for the few; for those who are content to practise absolute self-renunciation; to forsake the world and all its pleasures and devote themselves to a life of contemplation, not with the hope of obtaining individual happiness as their reward, but merely that an increase of general happiness may result from their self-denial and good works.

This high doctrine did not commend itself to the Tibetan mind, nor can we wonder that it did not; for the natural cravings of the human soul for the bread of eternal life are not to be satisfied with the stone of Nirvana. Nevertheless, erroneous as Sakya-muni's teaching was, it is idle to deny that his doctrine of self-

¹ "Tibet and the Tibetans," F. Grénard, 1904. Hutchinson. "The Yangtze Valley and Beyond," Mrs. Bishop, 1899. Murray.

renunciation was a very high ideal; in fact, it is a perversion of the highest Christian asceticism. The Christian ascetic renounces the world and his own will to do the will of God for the sake of the love of God; the Buddhist ascetic renounces the world and his own will for the love of his fellow-man, that the world may be the better for his self-renunciation in some remote way. The Tibetans could not understand Sakya-muni's teaching, hence their form of Buddhism is very corrupt. They borrowed a host of Hindoo divinities, whom they fear and endeavor to propitiate by a continuous round of superstitious practices and idolatrous worship rather than to tread the mystic path which is supposed to lead to Nirvana. Originally Buddhism was devoid of worship; its votaries devoted themselves to the deepest contemplation, sitting absolutely motionless, wrapped in the most profound meditation; but Tibetan Buddhism consists in endless rites and ceremonies, prostrations, turning prayer-wheels, waving flags and streamers covered with prayers, muttering one short mystic sentence, the Buddhist formula, "*Om mani padmé hum,*" ten thousand times a day, dancing, spinning, saying their rosaries, walking in processions, going on pilgrimages, entertaining all the gods one day and all the devils another at banquets, swallowing pills made of relics supposed to be indulgences, wearing amulets and charms and practising all kinds of witchcraft, exorcisms and magic.²

They dance mad sarabands, M. Grénard says, to expel the devil, and are constantly spinning round sacred mountains, lakes and heaps of stones covered with prayers, which are found all over the country, all travelers contributing a stone to every heap they pass. This spinning appears to be a relic of sun worship, for they always turn in the direction of the sun. Then they have grafted the ancient religion of the worship of ancestors, derived from China, onto Buddhism, in which originally it had no place. Once a year a great feast in honor of the departed is kept, when they make offerings to the shades of their ancestors, who receive the title of gods.

The popular idea of the Buddhist doctrine of the transmigration of souls is incorrect; it is not the passing of a soul into another body and a continuation of the personality after death. The original doctrine of metempsychosis as defined by M. Grénard is "that the soul is a series of psychic acts and attributes and that after death these psychic facts continue to subsist and influence the entire life of the world by entering into new combinations." This, however, is "caviare to the general," and is only held by the most learned and

² "Tibet and the Tibetans," by M. F. Grénard.

most distinguished teachers. Buddhists in general have come to believe that the souls of the departed come to life in a different form without remembering their former state. The form the next incarnation will take is determined by the conduct during life.

Tibetans, however, will have none of this teaching, either in its highest or in its popular form. They insist that the souls of their departed relations shall go as straight to the western paradise as prayers, incantations, alms and various rites can send them, and accordingly the lamas who make a fine market out of this preferential belief are obliged to yield to the popular feeling and act upon it.

They therefore visit the dead person and pray by his bedside and celebrate a service in the temple for his soul, while the relations give large alms to the poor and to the priests, believing it will help the soul to paradise. The lamas give the corpse a scarf of honor, the usual Tibetan gift prescribed by etiquette, and exhort him on no account to come back to the world, but to follow the very elaborate directions they give him concerning the road to paradise. The Tibetan people have a great dread of a dead person returning to earth, and for forty-nine days after death they place food on his grave to support him on his journey. This is a very ancient custom, and is described in Tibetan books of the seventh century. They dress up a block of wood in the deceased person's clothes, put his portrait on the top and place it on his tomb. The portrait is finally burnt and the ashes mixed with earth and made into a sort of cone, which is kept on the altar that finds a place in every Tibetan house.

Every family has a special divinity, represented by the image of a sow's head. To this every morning they offer wine, water and milk. They light a lamp before it and burn a piece of juniper, the sacred shrub of Tibet. In the evening a piece of lighted juniper is carried through the house to drive out the evil spirits.

Doctrinally Tibetan Buddhism is a religion of contradictions. It is a mixture of atheism and pantheism, of monotheism and polytheism. Practically it is a mixture of heathen superstitions and Christian practices. In metaphysics and in worship it has borrowed much from Brahminism, and many things supposed to have been taken from Christianity were taken from the older Indian religions. Some Christian customs have been adopted from the Nestorian Christians established in China and Mongolia in the Middle Ages.³

This intercourse explains what would otherwise be unaccountable in a country so cut off from external influence, namely, the similarity of certain of their religious rites and practices with some

³ "Tibet and the Tibetans."

of those of the Catholic Church; but what can explain the still more extraordinary coincidence that many things in the government and organization of the religious orders in the Catholic Church are so similar to those of the Tibetan monks? To take a few examples: There are various different orders of Tibetan monks, some stricter, some less strict than others, just as there are in the Catholic Church.

As in the Benedictine Order the smaller houses or priories are under priors and subject to the larger monasteries, which are governed by Abbots, so among the Tibetan monks the smaller priories are subject to the mother house and governed by priors; the large monasteries are ruled by Abbots, often exceedingly powerful. As in the Dominican, Franciscan and many other orders of the Catholic Church, the local superiors are under a provincial, who in his turn is under the general of his order, so in Tibet the abbots of the various orders are under a provincial, the provincial under a general.

Tibetan monks serve a novitiate after being postulants for a time. Their term of probation is a long one; it lasts twelve years before they attain the highest grade. They can then fill various offices under the abbot, such as procurator, bursar, novice master, steward, librarian, apothecary, etc. They take lifelong vows of celibacy; they practise poverty and obedience and are bound to study. Hence they are the most cultured class in the country. Poverty appears to be a counsel of perfection not enforced by a vow, for each monk lives according to his means and his piety. Every monk has a cell of his own, very often among the richer lamasseries a house of his own, a monastery usually being a collection of buildings enclosed within walls. The monastery is only bound to supply each monk from the common funds with a certain quantity of barley and with a piece of cloth for clothing during the year, and with butter and tea three times a day. Tibetan butter, by the way, unlike European butter, is supposed to improve by keeping. It is used for burning in lamps instead of oil, and is put into tea instead of milk or cream. Buttered tea is as thick as chocolate and is the national beverage. The barley with which the monks are supplied is ground up and made into "psamba," which is mixed with tea by stirring the tea with the forefinger, twirling the cup or bowl round on the palm of the left hand.

A lama is not bound to leave all his property to his monastery. He only bequeathes a certain part of his private means to his lamassery; the rest goes back to his family.

M. Grénard estimates, and McRockhill agrees with him, that the population of Tibet is about 3,000,000, and out of this 500,000

are monks. All the flower of the nobility and gentry, all the finest and cleverest boys become monks. Every family, rich or poor, contributes one son to the religious orders, and every family of five sends two to be monks; in other words, every other son in each family becomes a monk, and it is the only chance the lower classes have of rising to a better position. The above estimate does not include the monks in Ladak and Sikkim, who are very numerous.

There are about 3,000 monasteries in Tibet; most of them on mountains and inaccessible places; some, as at Shasa and Tashilumpo, are in cities. Many of them are like fortresses and contain arms and ammunition, and in case of need the monks make their habits into trousers and arm and come out and fight or remain and defend their monasteries, as the case may be of offensive or defensive tactics.

The occupations of the lamas, who are monks rather than priests, vary very much. They may be, according to circumstances, parish priests or doctors, apothecaries or printers, sculptors or writers, wizards or fortune tellers, beggars or sellers of charms, horoscopes, incantations or indulgences in the shape of pills. They are sent for on all occasions by the people; at births, deaths, burials, sickness, betrothals, marriages, and are handsomely paid for all their services. They don't trouble themselves in the least about the spiritual welfare of the people. All they care about is to get as much out of them as they can and keep them under their authority in temporal matters as much as possible.⁴

Pure Buddhism is not a religion for the laity; it is only for the few. Hence the Buddhism of the Lamasseries is very different from that of the county, and the lamas have been forced, partly from greed of money and love of power, to indulge the people in many religious practices in which they themselves have no faith.

The whole country is ruled by the lamas, the Tale or Dalai Lama being the supreme ruler, higher than any of the Kings. Ecclesiastically he is the most important of all the generals, but still he is only "primus inter pares," but temporally he is supreme and his temporal power gives him a higher rank than the other generals. In this respect he differs from the Pope, to whom he is often compared. After the Tale Lama the Lama of Tachilumpo is the next highest personage in Tibet. He is very powerful, and the Chinese make use of his power and authority to keep the Tale Lama in check.

⁴ See "Tibet and the Tibetans."

⁵ "Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet," by Surat Chandra Das. "Exploration of Thibet," by Mr. Sandberg.

⁶ See "The Exploration of Thibet," by Sandberg.

M. Grénard scarcely mentions Tibetan nuns, but we learn from Surat Chandra Das,⁵ who succeeded in visiting Lhasa (in which M. Grénard failed), that they are very numerous. Every respectable woman who is unmarried becomes a nun. Very frequently the girls leave home and enter a convent to avoid home duties, a practice perhaps not unheard of nearer home. Mr. Sandberg, who visited some convents, says: "The nuns seemed very happy. Their faces were smeared with gutta-percha, after the fashion of the country, and they varied in age from eleven to quite old women."⁶

There is one very celebrated lamessa, or abbess, who is one of the sights of Tibet. She rules the very important convent of Samding, and is supposed to be an incarnation of a divinity and to have taken form from a spirit called the Dorje-Pagmo. She was twenty-six when Chandra Das saw her, and wore her long black hair down her back. All other Tibetan nuns have their heads shaved. She is greatly venerated, and when she goes out is carried under a baldacchino; two mules precede her carrying incense pans, and perfumes are burnt before her by some monks all through her journey. Every year she is visited by pilgrims, who make her offerings.

Like the Poor Clares, she never lies down at night. She may, however, recline on a cushion or in a chair during the day; but at night she sits cross-legged on a cushion engaged in meditation. Her convent contains monks as well as nuns, from which grave scandals result. She rules supreme over all. She seems to be a sort of priestess, for she performs all sorts of magical rites and incantations, some of which are for the recovery of sick persons. She and all the Buddhist nuns take a vow of chastity, but when the Italian Capuchins visited Lhasa Father Belligatti was told a few years previously the Lamessa of Samding, in spite of her high spiritual birth, had scandalized the whole city by giving birth to a Lamessina. She still retained her position, and soon after announced she was about to engage in spiritual exercises which would occupy her three years, and which, let us hope, were of a penitential character.

The most important monastery after that at Lhasa, where the Tale Lama lives, is that of Tachilumpo, near the lay town of Shigatz. The abbot is next in power to the Tale Lama, and rules over the whole of the large province of Chang, in which he is supreme.

Another celebrated monastery and place of pilgrimage is at Skuburn. In a chapel here are some shrubs, the bark and leaves of which are supposed to be miraculously studded with Thibetan

characters, but the lamas confess that the letters are made by the monks with their finger nails, though they say the first tree did bear letters. This original tree grows on the spot where a great Buddhist reformer named Tsoungkapa was born, and his blood is supposed to have fertilized the soil and made the tree bear letters. It is considered an infallible remedy for barrenness, for barren women to visit this tree, to pray and lick the ground at its roots; and many come for this purpose. This monastery is in the extreme east of Tibet, not far from Sining. The temple in the centre of the monastery has a gold roof.

If the similarity between some Buddhist and some Christian customs, though partly accounted for, is strange, and if the similarity between their monastic institutions and ours is stranger, strangest of all is the similarity between certain doctrines in the two religions, of which we will give examples immediately.

A lama doctor whom M. Grénard met who had traveled in India, China, Turkestan, Mongolia and made several Tibetan pilgrimages gave it as his opinion that the three religions—Christianity, Buddhism and Mahommedanism—were at the bottom one and the same religion, with similar ethical teaching, and that Christ, Sakya-muni and Mahomet were all prophets inspired by the same Divinity called by the Christians God the Father, by the Buddhists Sankyé and by the Mahometans Allah. Of course no Christian can endorse the good doctor's opinion, but it is a very interesting one, for it shows in the first place that educated Buddhists believe in one Supreme Divine Spirit, in God; and in the next, that if only Buddhists and Christians knew more of each others' doctrines the Buddhist mind is by no means incapable of understanding and even of accepting Christianity.

To compare smaller things with great we often hear it said that the Ritualistic party in this little island is preparing the English nation for returning to the Catholic faith. Perhaps the Buddhism of Sakya-muni in its purest form, divested of idolations and heathenish practices, is preparing the Buddhist mind to accept Christianity. One thing is certain, neither Buddhists nor Mahometans nor any Eastern nation will ever be converted to Christianity by married missionaries nor by European women missionaries, who outrage all Eastern ideas of propriety and decorum by their costume and Western manners. Mrs. Bishop was most strong on this subject, and in her interesting book on China points out the harm done in that country by European women missionaries.⁷ Equally certain is it that Catholicity, with its grand ritual and ceremonies on the one hand, its mysticism and asceticism on the other, is the only form

⁷ "The Yangtze Valley and Beyond," by Mrs. Bishop.

of Christianity, which will appeal to or satisfy the Eastern mind and soul.

To give an instance of the kind of similarity between some Christian and Buddhist doctrines, the Buddhist, as we have seen above, believes in a Divine Being who is One in essence, infinite, varied in attributes, from whom all things come and to whom all return. He also believes that this eternal, incorruptible Being or First Principle manifests Himself in Three Persons *without affecting the unity of His essence*. These three persons are not the same as the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, but surely it is a very wonderful fact that such a doctrine exists at all in a false religion. Still more strange is it that the third person of the Buddhist Trinity is supposed to proceed from the other two persons. The first person in their Trinity is the transcendental Buddha, the second is the celestial Buddha, the third is the terrestrial. The celestial Buddha proceeds from the transcendental, of which he is the reflection and representation; the terrestrial is Buddha made man.

Thus it appears that the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation are not new ideas to the educated Buddhists, but in a perverted form are held by them now, so that they would find less difficulty in accepting Christianity than Mahometans; for Buddhism in its purest forms is much nearer akin to Christianity than Mahometanism, since it is a much more spiritual religion.

Although railways and modern means of intercommunication have brought the East and West into closer communion with each other, we shall have to divest ourselves of the popular notion that all whom we call heathen are also ignorant before the hope of the evangelization of the East can be realized. We must also remember that though heathen, they are intensely religious, particularly the Tibetans, and though followers of a false religion, their enthusiasm constantly amounts to fanaticism in a way that often puts us Christians to shame.

As for their ignorance, M. Grénard tells us that in the seventh century Chinese, Indian and Tibetan philosophers had evolved the same system of philosophy which the German school of the eighteenth century thought they had first discovered; and modern travelers assure us that Buddhist lamas, Chinese and Hindoo philosophers are among the most cultured of men, the subtlety of the Eastern mind lending itself specially to the study of philosophy, while their skill as linguists is rarely equaled by Europeans.

Now that the British Government has got a foothold in Tibet, if Catholic missionaries could only steal a march on the Protestant missions sure sooner or later to be sent, there would be some chance of converting the Tibetans, whereas Protestantism is bound

to fail in this. Only the Catholic Church can ever satisfy the intellectual and spiritual desires of the souls of all sorts and conditions of men.

DARLEY DALE.

Scientific Chronicle.

SOME FACTS ABOUT ARSENIC.

The virulence of a poison is sometimes expressed by declaring it to be "as poisonous as arsenic." People who are in the habit of making this statement, as we can easily imagine, in sepulchral tones, will be somewhat astounded to hear that arsenic is contained in minute quantities in nearly all organs of the body, the proportion in some being relatively large, leading to the view that their efficient working depends on the presence of this element. M. Armand Gautier is responsible for this observation, and in a recent paper presented to the Académie des Sciences he gives some additional facts. The source of this arsenic is in the food we eat. Some of the figures in the paper referred to give the amounts of arsenic contained in various food stuffs. The figures give the weight of arsenic in thousandths of a milligramme contained in 100 grammes (0.22 pound) of fresh solids or in one liter (nearly a quart) of liquids: Beef (lean), 0.8; milk, 1.0; eggs, yolk, 0.5; white, 0.0; mackerel, 3.9; lobster (muscular part), 2.2; eggs, 35.7; shell, 104; water extract, 10.7; shrimp, 0.16; shell of same, 7.6; wheat, 0.7; potato, 1.12; wine, 0.89; beer, 6.01; salt, refined, 0.7; gray salt, 45; rock salt, 14. On the basis of these figures M. Gautier has calculated that the average amount of arsenic taken into the system per day is very close to 0.021 milligramme or about 0.0003 grain.

These results need not alarm us, as the arsenic, if it is present in the elemental state, is not poisonous. The white oxide, which is commonly called arsenic, is extremely poisonous, but only in doses of from two to three grains. It is used as a medicine, being especially useful in skin diseases. One can get used to taking comparatively large doses of the oxide by beginning with very small amounts and gradually increasing them, and indeed this is said to be done by peasants in certain mountain regions of the world, as in the Tyrol, for example. There is a reason for this. Arsenic strengthens the power of the respiratory organs and is thus a means of facilitating mountain climbing. We can easily conclude from these facts that if there ever was any danger from the arsenic in foods, and it is difficult, nay, impossible, to see how there can be danger from the small amount present, it has been obviated long since. Most of us must have reached the stage at which we can take our daily allotment with impunity.

There is another source, however, from which serious cases of arsenical poisoning have arisen. We refer to wall papers and fabrics colored with compounds of arsenic, notably with Scheele's green and Paris green. As early as 1869 it was determined with reasonable accuracy that such papers were responsible for poisoning, either from the absorption of arsenical dust or from the breathing of volatile compounds of arsenic formed from the paper. Subsequent investigation has confirmed this result, and there are on record many cases of poisoning from arsenic which was traced to the wall paper of the rooms occupied by the patients, the symptoms ceasing when the paper was removed. A bulletin of the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Chemistry, recently published, gives a table of the amounts of arsenic contained in various samples of wall papers. The results are thus summarized:

1. The number of papers containing more than 0.1 grain per square yard is very small and has been much reduced since the passage of the Massachusetts law of 1900.
2. Most of the papers containing more than 0.1 grain per square yard are of foreign make.
3. There seems to be no reason why papers cannot be manufactured that contain no arsenic at all.
4. Since it is very doubtful whether 0.1 grain of arsenic per square yard is entirely harmless, it would appear that if any be present the amount should not exceed 0.05 grain per square yard.

Of fabrics it is said that "entirely too large a percentage of the dress goods, dress furs and fur rugs sold on the American market contain excessive amounts of arsenic."

NITROGEN FOR FERTILIZERS.

In a recent number of the *QUARTERLY* an account was given of some experiments made in Germany with nitrogen-fixing bacteria. It was hoped that the commercial introduction of these bacteria would prove to be a solution of the nitrogen problem in agriculture. However successful as the investigators had been in the laboratory, their product was not a success in the field, and so the manufacture of the prepared organisms was given up. It seemed a pity that such a promising method of increasing the world's supply of available nitrogen should be abandoned, and so the matter was taken up by the United States Department of Agriculture and investigations were made in its laboratories under the direction of Dr. George T. Moore, of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

In the course of the investigation it was found that bacteria bred in Media of the usual kind containing much nitrogen were of practically no use in fixing atmospheric nitrogen and making it available as nitrates for plant nourishment; so a nearly nitrogen-full culture medium was secured and used with gratifying success. It was discovered that the power of the organisms to fix nitrogen could be thereby increased five or ten times. And so a large number of cultures were made and about ten thousand of them sent to various parts of the country, together with specific directions as to method of application. The culture is dry, of about the size and form of an yeast cake. The drying process does not affect the bacteria, which can be revived after being in this state for a year or more. To revive them they are immersed in water to which the proper amount of nutrient salts is added. Here they multiply rapidly, the water frequently turning milky white from the number formed in twenty-four hours.

This water containing the organisms may now be applied either to the seed or to a cartload of earth, which is then spread over the field to be inoculated. Have the results been gratifying? Very much so. Of the ten thousand cultures sent out nearly three thousand have been reported upon, and almost all favorably. In some places one part of a field was inoculated, while the other was left as usual with ordinary fertilizing. The contrast was remarkable. The plants in the inoculated portion of the field were so dense that no ground was visible between them; those in the remaining part were sparse and small. The yield was in proportion, being increased 400 or 500 per cent. and sometimes more. Plants were sent to the department from both parts of the field, one being four or five times the size of the other, though grown from the same seed and, barring the inoculation in one case, under the same conditions of soil and climate.

COPPER SULPHATE AS A WATER PURIFIER.

No one will question the importance of keeping the water supply of a community free from contamination from any and every source. It is of little use to spend millions in order to enlarge the capacity of our reservoirs if the water to be stored in these same reservoirs is not reasonably pure and odorless. Strange to say, the importance of this fact has impressed itself upon the country at large only within the last ten years. At the outset it was evident that in order to know what preventive measures to adopt the sanitary engineer

must know the nature of the pollution. So the chemist was called in to analyze the water. The results were, however, not satisfactory, for although the amounts of organic and mineral matter in the water, as well as the percentage of albumenoid ammonia, were accurately determined, it was found that waters were often drunk with impunity, although they contained large quantities of these substances. The foulness of the smell arising from some waters was what disgusted people more than anything else. Yet some foul-smelling waters are comparatively harmless in their effects, while many clear sparkling waters contain baneful bacteria in abundance. Of late years the microscope has been brought to the aid of the chemist, and as a result it has been agreed that a bacteriological examination is just as important as a chemical one. The turbidity, bad tastes and odors of waters are due to the growth of some minute plant or animal, the algae and certain bacteria and some minute animal organisms; but the algae are the most responsible.

These algae are a group of plants numbering about one-fifth of the known cryptogams or flowerless plants; their usual habitat is water or very damp places. Botanists locate the ancestors of the entire vegetable kingdom among them. They sometimes reach the length of 700 or 800 feet, and certain grass-green forms frequently form a green "scum" on the surface of stagnant pools called "frog spawn" or "pond scum." Some cause trouble in a mechanical way, while some undoubtedly help to purify water. Those popularly known as "blue-green algae," or schizophyceae, which, by the way, may have various shades of olive, yellow and brown, chocolate or purplish red, are the great offenders in the matter of water pollution. Some means have been sought to remove this source of contamination. Since most algae must have light in order to develop, the covering of reservoirs has sometimes been resorted to, but the expense is far too great for this measure to have any extensive application. A good preventive measure is to keep organic matter from getting into the reservoir. Aeration is not of much use, as algae often multiply more rapidly when oxygen is plentifully supplied. A new and seemingly universally applicable method is the use of copper sulphate in dilutions so great as to be colorless, tasteless and harmless to man. It is cheap, the cost of treating water for the extermination of algae being not over sixty cents per million gallons. It can be used also for destroying pathogenic bacteria, but only in more concentrated solutions, and may be removed afterwards by precipitation. It can be so applied as to leave beneficial bacteria unharmed. Finally it promises to be of use in exterminating mosquito larvæ. The United States Department of

Agriculture is still experimenting, and we may hope for great benefit therefrom for the water supply of the entire country.

THE ELECTRIFICATION OF TWO GREAT RAILROADS.

On November 12 last an electric locomotive hauled a full-sized passenger train over a specially prepared track near Schenectady, New York, at a speed of sixty-nine miles an hour. During the trial it outsped the fast "New York" express, which was running on a parallel track at nearly sixty miles an hour. The trial was made for the New York Central Railroad, and it may fairly be looked upon as marking an epoch in railroading, for after the trial an order was placed with the General Electric Company for fifty or sixty similar locomotives. The third rail system was used, the rail being protected by a wooden hood, which makes it impossible for any one to make contact with the rail unless he wishes to; although, as a matter of precaution, an overhead transmission has been adopted at crossings and stations.

The managers of the New York Central have been considering for a long time the feasibility of electrifying at least portions of their immense train system. There was a general demand for a change in the vicinity of New York city especially. People have not been slow to appreciate the comfort arising from electrically propelled trains, especially the absence of dust and smoke, the rapidity of starting and stopping and the ease with which large trains could be run at frequent intervals for suburban traffic. The company, therefore, has let out contracts for the electrification of its entire system within the "New York zone," south of Croton on the main line and south of White Plains on the Harlem division. The New York, New Haven and Hartford will be similarly equipped south of Woodlawn. Electric locomotives will do the work for the through and express trains, while each car intended for suburban work only will be equipped with its own motor.

The Northeastern Railroad of Great Britain has completed the electrification of its lines within the district of Tyneside. The authorities of the road were driven to do this by the competition of the street railways in the district. The third rail is used here also, and electric locomotives will be used for freight haulage, the passenger coaches having motors for themselves. The steam locomotive has now a dangerous competitor which surpasses it in cheapness and convenience of service.

THE SIMPLON TUNNEL.

Our readers are doubtless aware of the immense tunnel that is being bored through the Alps from the Rhone Valley to Northern Italy. The total length when completed will be $12\frac{1}{4}$ miles, of which distance only 260 yards remain unfinished. The engineers in charge have had many great difficulties to overcome. First of all the temperature at the depth of the tunnel beneath the surface, 7,005 feet, or nearly $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, fifty per cent. deeper than man has ever been before, ranges from 100 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit, and an elaborate system of air cooling had to be resorted to. Then springs have been encountered which have seriously interfered with the progress of the work. One in 1901 discharged nearly 8,000 gallons of water per minute. Recently another burst upon the workmen with serious loss of life. It was of boiling water and flowed at the rate of 18,000 gallons per minute. This accident was thought by some engineers to be fatal to the enterprise, but the pluck and persistency that has come to the assistance of the clever engineers in the past will surely not desert them now. At least let us hope that this great undertaking will not prove past accomplishment.

GENERAL NOTES.

THE HYDROSCOPE.—One of the writer's early recollections is that of the description of an apparatus by which the bottoms of rivers, ponds and even the sea bottom could be viewed from the surface. It was very simply constructed, consisting merely of a hollow tin vessel shaped like a truncated pyramid somewhat elongated, blackened on the inside and having a piece of glass cemented in for a base. The claim was made that if this was placed in water with the bottom upwards, the privacy of the finny denizens of the deep would be intruded upon and many wonders laid bare if one would but take the trouble to look. No attempt was made by the writer to prove this statement, who is glad to note that an invention designed for the same purpose has been used successfully in Italy. Cavaliere Giuseppe Pino is the inventor, and the instrument is called the hydroscope. It consists of a steel tube provided with a complex system of lenses numbering twelve. The lenses, of course, are in the submerged end of the instrument, and the images formed by them are reflected upwards by means of mirrors to a sort of camera obscura house on the top above the surface of the

water. One of the instruments can be fitted into the bottom of a war vessel and so arranged that it can be withdrawn and made flush with the bottom. The inventor has been able to read a newspaper at a depth of 360 feet from the surface by means of the ordinary daylight which has penetrated to that depth, so that light will not be wanting. Searchlights could be used, too, and placed beside the lenses.

A PLAN FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE EARTH'S CRUST.—At a recent meeting of the British Association the Hon. C. A. Parsons suggested that our knowledge of the earth's crust might be materially extended by borings made in the crust to a depth of twelve miles, the operations to extend over a number of years if necessary. Another scientist objected that at this depth the pressure of the overlying rock would aggregate forty tons per square inch. At this pressure rock would become viscous, and by flowing inward would put a stop to further boring. Mr. Parsons suggests that an experiment be made to determine if such would be the case. A column of granite or quartz rock should be taken and fitted into a steel mold. Steel flows at a pressure lying between 120 and 300 tons. If now a small hole were to be bored through the centre and a pressure of 100 tons per square inch be applied, the rock would be under the pressure that would be exerted upon it at a depth of thirty-eight miles. Any shrinkage in it could be easily observed. does now.

AN OLD RIVER CHANNEL.—Geologists have known for a long time, but few laymen have ever suspected, that there is a submarine grand canyon of the Hudson river. The slope of the ocean bottom off the continent at New York is only about one foot in 968 for a distance of over 120 miles. At this point the waters suddenly deepen, and this marks the edge of the continental shelf. Soundings have revealed a marked depression in this shelf. A gorge has receded inward for nearly thirty miles, with a depth of at least 4,800 feet. This merges into a valley which extends back for 71 miles with a depth of from 6,000 or 7,000 to 9,000 feet. More recent soundings have shown more of the real form of this valley and gorge, which must mark the old course of the Hudson when the continent stood ten thousand feet higher above the sea than it

A NOVEL FIRE PROTECTION.—Recently in London a simple but very effective contrivance for the protection of buildings from fire was exhibited with marked success. It consists of a horizontal pipe carried completely around the building near the roof line. This

pipe is perforated on the under side, the holes being very close together, and is connected to a vertical standpipe, in which the water is under a pressure of eighty pounds to the square inch. When the valves are opened the stream of water forms a curtain completely around the building. A similar pipe on the roof, arranged so as to throw a sheet of water entirely across, completes the apparatus, which is said to have so impressed the insurance companies that they granted a material reduction in the premium.

PEARY'S NEW DASH FOR THE POLE.—Peary is to start next summer on another dash for the Pole. He is confident of success this time. The steamer he is constructing in Maine will be a marvel of strength and will have besides an ice-breaker in the bow, a bottom so constructed that she will rise if ice were to close in upon her. The famous commander will start by way of the shores of Grant land, and when he reaches a point far enough north will continue the journey on sledges, taking Esquimaux as his companions and living as they live. He will construct numerous caches and so establish his base of supplies as to have them as close to the Pole as possible. Peary knows thoroughly what he is undertaking. Let us hope he will succeed.

DR. HEDIN'S EXPLORATIONS.—The results of Dr. Sven Hedin's three years' explorations in Central Asia are being rapidly made ready for complete publication. As a result of his work a region before practically unknown has been thrown open to the knowledge of the world in a way that one would not have thought possible for one man. Besides his explorations proper, Dr. Hedin made meteorological and astronomical observations of great value, besides gathering large collections of geological, zoological, botanical and archæological interest. These observations and collections are being discussed and described by experts. Four volumes of commentary will appear with an atlas of probably 120 maps.

M. J. AHERN, S. J.

Book Reviews.

AUBREY DE VERE. A memoir based on his unpublished diaries and correspondence. By *Wilfrid Ward*. With two photogravure portraits and other illustrations. 8vo., pp. x.+428. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This excellent memoir of so good a man is a great gain to English literature. That long life which began on January 10, 1814, and ended on January 21, 1902, is well worth the telling. And it is also worthy of the pen of Mr. Ward, who so far excels in biographical writing, and who is doing so much to give to the world a permanent true record of the illustrious and good men of the nineteenth century in England. And the world is much richer in the possession of such lives. It has many volumes that tell of the statesmen, and soldiers, and actors, who have moved across the stage, but their entrances and exits have not always been for edification. Too rare are lives like that of Aubrey de Vere, pure as the limpid stream which brings music to the ear and charm to the eye. He lived in the presence of God always; in constant communion with Him, seeing Him in all His works, and looking forward with a blessed hope to the moment when he should leave this world and meet Him face to face. How little the world and the worldling know of the charm of such a life! What infinite gain to the world if it can catch even a small taste of its beauty! If the world could only be induced to accept such a man for a hero and a model, how much better it would be! Many look on such a man as weak. But it is a mistake to suppose that refinement and delicacy of mind indicate lack of virility. On the contrary, such men are strongest because their higher nature is more fully developed, and they are strong intellectually and spiritually. Hence Aubrey de Vere won all who came in contact with him whose hearts were pure enough to bear the contact.

As another reviewer has said of him: "The refinement and delicacy of his mind never impaired its virility—nor the habitual solemnity of his thoughts, his gaiety and sense of humor—so that, as Coventry Patmore said, he 'looked like sunshine' to the friends he visited. Above all it was his sense of religion—as sweet and kindly as it was sincere and deep—pervading his whole life, that, reflected in his every action, imparted to them the incomparable charm of utter unworldliness.

"It is not wonderful that with such a man friends were not so much numerous as innumerable. His life was, in fact, made up of friendships as deep and tender as they were high-souled."

Among them we find the best and most prominent men and women of his time. For instance: Wordsworth, Southey, Campbell, Hartley, Sara Coleridge, Rogers, Sydney Smith, Mrs. Craven, Cardinal Newman, Father Faber and a host of others. Besides these he came in contact with nearly all, if not all, persons of prominence on many occasions, and he frequently refers to them and their movements in his letters and diary. And here it may not be amiss to let Mr. Ward tell us something of his own work. He says:

"When as Mr. de Vere's literary executor under his will I examined his papers with a view to publishing some of his prose remains I found that practically nothing was written of the second volume of *Recollections* which he had planned. The letters and diaries, however, which he was revising with a view to their possible posthumous publication at once struck me as in many cases suitable for this purpose, for they deal with matters of general interest and include some graphic contemporary descriptions of great men. Contemporary letters convey a sense of actuality which *Recollections* do not always carry.

"But while such features of interest were probably what led Mr. de Vere himself to contemplate the publication of his letters, the present writer was yet more impressed by the picture they conveyed of their author himself—of a personality which for spiritual beauty, both of mind and of character, and for the completeness in it of poetic temperment must, I think, be allowed to be one of very rare interest.

"His personality was one which made a deep impression on those who were intimate with him. 'I have lived among poets a great deal, and have known greater poets than he is, but a more entire poet, one more a poet in his whole mind and temperament, I never knew or met with.' Thus wrote Sara Coleridge, the daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, the intimate friend of Wordsworth and of the Southey's. Cardinal Newman once expressed to a friend an estimate of Aubrey de Vere very similar to Sara Coleridge's, and added that the power of self-expression displayed in his poetry (of parts of which the Cardinal was a great admirer) was not fully adequate to representing the beauty of the poet's mind.

"The present work is, then, in the first place an attempt at the exhibition of a very remarkable mind and character, as displayed in his intercourse and his correspondence with his friends. I have in my incidental selections from Aubrey de Vere's poetry had the same object in view; and while poems acknowledged to be among his happiest are included among them, my principal aim has been to choose those which best help to depict the poet himself.

"It will be to some readers an attraction, to others the reverse, that, as in the case of his beloved Dante, the poetry and philosophy of Christianity were the most absorbing subject of de Vere's imaginative meditation. The spirit breathed in the pictures of Giotto and Fra Angelico breathes in the letters and poems of Aubrey de Vere. And to minimize this element would be to fail in depicting the central object of his life and thought. Yet, as in the case of his great hero and friend Cardinal Newman, the play of human nature was very graceful and varied in him, and I have endeavored in my selection of material to do justice to both sides of his temperament."

We shall make a few quotations from letters and diaries to give the reader some idea of the treat in store for him. How very striking, for instance, is this short description of de Vere's first impression of Newman at Oxford in December, 1838:

"Early in the evening a singularly graceful figure in cap and gown glided into the room. The slight form and gracious address might have belonged either to a youthful ascetic of the Middle Ages or to a graceful, high-bred lady of our own days. He was pale and thin almost to emaciation, swift of pace, but when not walking, intensely still, with a voice sweet and pathetic, and so distinct that you could count each vowel and consonant in every word. When touching on subjects which interested him much he used gestures rapid and decisive, though not vehement. . . . As we parted I asked him why the cathedral bells rang so loudly at so late an hour. 'Only some young men keeping themselves warm,' he answered."

Of Oxford he says: "Oxford delighted me far beyond my expectations. If I may judge by the kindness with which I was treated, it quite as well deserves to be called a city of courtesy as of learning. Newman is the most monkish-looking man I ever saw—very dignified, very ascetical and so very humble and gentle in manner that it would almost have the air with which the Jesuits are reproached, if it were not accompanied by an equally remarkable simplicity."

Of the Oxford chapels and Newman at service he says: "I will not attempt a description of these marvelous chapels of Oxford. You must only imagine the most exquisite combination of stone cut into lacework, and enormous windows, every single pane of which is blushing 'with blood of Queens and Kings.' I attended evening service at Christ Church and morning at St. Mary's, the parish church which Newman belongs to. It is about as large as an Irish cathedral, and as rich as all of them put together. Newman's reading is a beautiful sort of melodious, plaintive and rather

quick half-chant. The prayers he says kneeling at the steps toward the altar, only turning to the people when he blesses them, as in the versicle, 'The Lord be with you, and with thy spirit.' He looks like a very young man made old by intense study—his forehead is very high, but not very broad."

In Lent, 1839, he visited Rome, and in a letter written to his sister in April he says:

"Rome is to me far the most interesting place I have ever been at. I am more surprised every day that it is not ten times as full of strangers as it is, for I should have thought that strangers from all parts of the world would have been continually flocking to Rome as a centre of universal interest. There is no refined taste which you cannot gratify here."

Then follow descriptions of churches, colleges, galleries and persons which are most appreciative. The following comment on the famous "Miserere," in the Pope's chapel, and the benediction from the balcony of St. Peter's is worth quoting:

"I must not forget to tell you that I was delighted even beyond my expectations with the 'Miserere' in the Pope's chapel. I heard it three times; it is, I think, the most exquisite music I ever heard. It is melancholy beyond all that I could have thought it possible to produce in sweet sounds, but at the same time so unearthly that you might fancy it the wailing of angels after their fall. The ceremonies of the Holy Week did not give me so much pleasure as I had expected with the exception of the benediction from the balcony of St. Peter's. The whole population of Rome and many from the neighborhood were collected within the embrace of the circular colonnades and in the court below; and it was a grand thing to see the immense multitude bowing down, like a cornfield yielding to the breeze, as the Pope extended his arms in the shape of a cross and pronounced his benediction 'Urbi et Orbi.'"

In the early forties, when the Oxford movement was approaching a crisis, we find Mr. de Vere back in London and in touch with those most intimately connected with that movement. From his diary of this time we cull the following:

"May 11—Went to Margaret Street Chapel. Dr. Pusey, who officiated, was like a saint in tribulation, or one over whom some great calamity was impending.

"May 12—Dined with Mr. Richards. Mr. Newman's conversion was openly spoken of. I saw a great deal of zeal, earnestness and Roman enthusiasm among the party, but nothing of largeness of mind and fearless love of Truth. My impression was that such men could not appreciate Catholicity as distinguished from Romanism, and that they felt no loyalty to the Church of England.

"May 14—Called on Dr. Pusey. He looked ill and seemed as if he had neither eaten nor slept for two days. He spoke cheerfully of the Church, but rather on Providential than on philosophical grounds, and rather pressed my taking orders. He approached the subject of Newman three or four times and glanced away again. At last he spoke of his change as certain; said it had been going on for these seven years and would be avowed this year; said it would be a great crisis, and by far the greatest blow the cause had received."

This is very interesting in the light of after events. The reader should remember that at this time Aubrey de Vere was not himself a Catholic. His approach to the Church was very gradual. His father intended him for the ministry, and although he never embraced that state, he was always a God-fearing, honest searcher after truth, and the following extract from a letter to his sister in 1851 indicates that at that time he was very close to it:

"There are some things here of such interest that I would not readily miss what perhaps may not soon be procurable again. The other morning, for instance, breakfasting with W. Monsell, I met three of the most distinguished theologians of three nations, whose conversation, as you may imagine, was such as is seldom heard. They were Manning, De Ravignan and Dr. Döllinger. The mode in which the three countries were represented by these three minds was extraordinary—the depth of the German, the scientific precision of the Frenchman and the grave vigor of the Englishman. Among other things they discussed the religious prospects of Europe. Döllinger took a sanguine view of them, De Ravignan rather a gloomy one, but all three agreed that the world would eventually be polarized into two great sections, the Roman and the infidel, and that all the intermediate theories were used up and worn out. How far this may be true I know not, but certainly I am every day more struck by the great difference which I observe between the Protestants and Roman Catholics with whom I converse. The former seem so vague in their faith and so shifting in their arguments; the latter always seem to me to hold all the great truths of the three creeds as in eagle talons. Whatever may be the character of their peculiar tenets, the great common dogmas of the faith seem to me secure with them only. This circumstance I own increases my reverence for Rome daily."

On November 15 of the same year, in the Archbishop's chapel at Avignon, whither he had gone with Dr. Manning, Aubrey de Vere was received into the Catholic Church. On the same day he wrote to Mrs. Coleridge:

"After my letter to you from Paris, it will be no surprise to you

to learn that I was this morning received into what I believe to be that one Catholic and Apostolic Church confessed in the Creed and commissioned from on high by God Himself. For some time my convictions had been far clearer than those which we require for action in matters of secular concern, nay, had been as clear as I believe to be possible previous to action on matters which admit of no absolute and scientific demonstration because they belong to the supernatural region of faith. Such convictions involve duties, and that which we believe we are bound to confess. Such convictions, if they be true, come to us also by grace and through God's Providence; and His gifts, if not used, will be withdrawn. In this belief I have acted. May He accept the act as one of obedience to Him, and may He bestow on me those spiritual gifts of which obedience is the gate, especially humility, contrition and love."

Such faith and obedience bring their reward with them. Hence we are not surprised to hear the convert say:

"Do not imagine for a moment that a convert to Roman Catholicism loses any portion of sympathy with his old friends. I find exactly the contrary to be the case. Rome itself is half thrown away upon me from the degree in which my thoughts revert to those whom I most value, and my affection for whom seems to make newer friends of little interest. . . .

"From what Catholicism has taught me of Christianity, and from what confession (that most misapprehended of all things) has taught me of my own heart, and especially of the power of pride in its latent forms, I do not think that I could have continued a Christian had I not become a Roman Catholic, though I dare say I should have given the name of Christianity to whatever new heresy or new version of an old one I preferred to the 'Faith once for all delivered.'

"You will be glad to know how far Rome satisfies me. I can hardly tell you how entirely it does so. . . . I should probably have been a Catholic years ago if I had not been in some sort a poet, and had a poetical predilection for the vague in thought and the vagabond in life. Such dispositions are not quickly shaken off, and even after my reception I was more annoyed (as a matter of taste) by seeing these Southerners spitting in church than I was gratified by the marble of the temples and the incense cloud. But in all substantial things I have had a grave and solid satisfaction from the first, moral, intellectual and spiritual, and that satisfaction has been progressively deepening the more I have seen, thought and felt.

"The Roman Catholic Church is so very much more than I had

expected to find it, and that, while a Protestant, I ever imagined that a church could be. It is so distinct from, and so raised above, the very highest of its precious possessions. Abounding, for instance, in books, it is so wholly distinct from a 'literature' that millions might pass their lives (even among the intelligent) with hardly a remembrance that it has more than a few devotional books, the Bible and the decrees of the Councils.

"It is equally independent of science. If all the schoolmen and the fathers vanished in a moment, a Catholic feels that the sacred processes of the Church, her inner and outer life, would go on just as before, even as Nature would carry on her glorious works of mercy and power, though all the books of natural philosophy should be burned.

"It is so equally with art. The poorest village or mountain church in which there is an altar and the Blessed Sacrament makes a Catholic feel a diviner presence than I as a Protestant ever felt in cathedrals—that diviner presence which bears the same relation to Christianity and the Incarnate Word that the sentiment expressed by Gray's celebrated lines, '*Presentiorem perspicimus Deum*,' etc., bears to Natural Religion."

Aubrey de Vere's life after he entered the Catholic Church continued to be as calm and peaceful as the above quotation leads one to think it would be.

We shall close our review of this most delightful book with a description of the poet in extreme old age, from the pen of Mr. Edmund Gosse:

"Aubrey de Vere's appearance at the age of eighty-three is very vivid in my recollection. He entered the room swiftly and gracefully, the form of his body thrown a little forward, as is frequently the case with tall and active old men. His countenance bore a singular resemblance to the portraits of Wordsworth, although the type was softer and less vigorous. His forehead, which sloped a little and was very high and domed, was much observed in the open air from a trick he had of tilting his tall hat back. . . . There was something extraordinarily delicate and elevated in his address. He was, in fact, conversation made visible. I never knew a more persistent speaker. If he broke bread with one, the progress of the meal would be interrupted and delayed from the very first by his talk, which was softly, gently unbroken, like a fountain falling on moss. On one occasion we sat together in a garden in the summer. Mr. de Vere talked with no other interruption than brief pauses for reflection for three hours, in itself a prodigious feat for an old man of eighty-four, and without the smallest sign of fatigue.

"The principal, perhaps the only sign of extreme old age which the poet presented until lately was the weakness of his voice. This must have been, I think, very melodious, but already when I knew him first it had become so faint as to be sometimes scarcely audible, particularly in company. It was, therefore, very pleasant to be alone with him, especially in the open air, when he seemed to speak with particular freedom and ease. The astonishing fullness of his memory made his conversation marvelous and delightful. He not merely passed with complete comprehension of the relative distance from events of 1820 to events of to-day, but his verbal memory was astounding. He garnished his recollections of Wordsworth, Rogers, Landor or Sir Henry Taylor with copious and repeated quotation from their poetry. Indeed, he once assured me that of certain favorite poets—in particular Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats—he still retained at the age of eighty-four 'substantially the bulk of their writings.' He said that his principal occupation had been and still was, in his solitary walks, or by the fire, to repeat silently or aloud page after page of poetry. His memory of the great writers was, he believed, so exact that in these exercises he had the illusion that he was reading from the printed book."

WHOSOEVER SHALL OFFEND. By *F. Marion Crawford*. With eight illustrations drawn in Rome, with the author's suggestions, by Horace T. Carpenter. 12mo., pp. 388. New York: Macmillan Company.

The full title of Mr. Crawford's latest story is contained in the following words of Christ: "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

The scene is laid in Italy, principally at Rome. An unprincipled Italian adventurer who is a fugitive from justice in South America, where he has committed murder, succeeds in concealing his identity and in marrying a wealthy Roman widow with one child—a son in his sixteenth year. The adventurer conducts himself so well that his wife makes a new will three years after their marriage, leaving him a life interest in part of her estate and the reversion of the whole in case anything should happen to her son. Then the adventurer poisons his wife without exciting suspicion and tries to murder the boy. In this, however, he fails, and the victim with a fractured skull wanders away and is taken in by an obscure country innkeeper and his wife, who rob him and plot for his death that they may not be disturbed in the possession of their plunder. He is saved by a peasant girl who works at the inn and who falls in love with the sick boy. Of this peasant girl we are told that she

is handsome, clever and fearless, but that "her moral inheritance was not all that might be desired; for her father had left her mother in a fit of pardonable jealousy, after nearly killing her and quite killing his rival, and her mother had not redeemed her character after his abrupt departure. On the contrary, if an accident had not carried her off suddenly, Regina's virtuous parent would probably have sold the girl into slavery."

After Regina has succeeded in getting the young man Marcello to a hospital, where his memory is restored by a surgical operation, his stepfather, Folco Corbario, fits up an establishment for him and Regina quite convenient to the family palace, and then they begin their sinful career so openly that every one knows of it. From this time it is the purpose of Folco to induce the young man to kill himself by dissipation in order that he may get possession of the inheritance. To this end he gives him advice like this:

"The only thing you had better avoid for a few years is marriage!" Falco laughed softly as he delivered this bit of advice and lit a cigar. Then he looked critically at Marcello.

"You are still very pale," he observed thoughtfully. "You have not got back all your strength yet. Drink plenty of champagne at luncheon and dinner. There is nothing like it when a man is run down. And don't sit up all night smoking cigarettes more than three times a week!"

It is not quite clear why Falco did not murder Marcello as he had attempted to do near the beginning of the story, but that would end the tale too soon, at least for commercial purposes. The nature of the alliance between Marcello and Regina is flaunted in the face of the reader at every turn, and there is never a hint of its abomination. On the contrary, the impression might easily be created, especially on young minds, that it was excusable and in more ways than one commendable. If we quote on this point, we do so with apologies to our readers and for the purpose of justifying the conclusion which we intend to draw.

The peasant girl never had the slightest hope of marriage; in fact, she did not desire it. Hear her:

"You wish to please me? Love me! That is what I want. Love me as much as you can, it will always be less than I love you; and as long as you can, it will always be less than I shall love you, for that will be always. And when you are tired of me tell me so, heart of my heart, and I will go away, for that is better than to hang like a chain on a young man's neck. I will go away and God will forgive me, for to love you is all I know."

When her lover wishes to hang jewels about her neck she refuses them with these words:

"Keep those things for your wife!" she said with flashing eyes and standing back from him. "I will wear the clothes you buy for me because you like me to be pretty, and I don't want you to be ashamed of me. But I will not take jewels, for jewels are money, just as gold is! You can buy a wife with that stuff, not a woman who loves!"

It was while this sinful alliance was in full vigor that the heroine gave this exhibition of her respect for sacred things:

"Do you take me for a Turk?" Regina asked, laughing. "I go to confession at Christmas and Easter. I tell the priest that I am very bad and am sorry, but that it is for you and that I cannot help it. Then he asks me if I will promise to leave you and be good. And I say no, that I will not promise that. And he tells me to go away and come back when I am ready to promise, and that he will give me absolution then. It is always the same. He shakes his head and frowns when he sees me coming, and I smile. We know each other quite well now. I have told him that when you are tired of me, then I will be good. Is not that enough? What can I do? I should like to be good, of course, but I like still better to be with you. So it is."

"You are better than the priest knows," said Marcello thoughtfully, "and I am worse."

On another occasion she says to her lover:

"Are we not happy here? Is it not cool in the summer and sunny in the winter? Have we not all we want? When you marry, your wife will live in the splendid villa on the Janiculum, and when you are tired of her, you will come and see Regina here. I hope you will always be tired of her. Then I shall be happy."

But the inevitable end must come. Falco is discovered and he kills the tool who has been acting as servant and spy in the house of Marcello and Regina. He is sentenced to thirty-seven years' imprisonment, although he has killed many persons.

Regina contracts a fever and dies, while Marcello marries a respectable and beautiful young lady whom he has really loved from childhood.

Regina, almost at the last moment, is asked if she wishes to see a priest, and she says: "Yes, there is time for that." We had hoped that she would die repentant, but these are her last recorded words, spoken to the respectable lady who is later to marry Marcello:

"If you have ever stood between us," she said, "you had the right. He loved you first. There is nothing to forgive in that. Afterwards he loved me a little. No one can take that from me; no one! It is mine, and it is all that I have, and though I am

going, and though I know that he is tired of me, it is still more than the world. To have it as I have it, I would do again what I did from the first."

And then the author pictures Marcello and the respectable lady whom he is going to marry visiting the tomb of the public unrepentant sinner to plant flowers on it and pray at it.

The book is bad. It will do great harm because it comes from the pen of Mr. Crawford and has an air of respectability about it. But it teaches the reader that tolerant familiarity with impurity which ought to be despised and abhorred. Nothing could be more degrading than the picture of the woman who is about to pass into eternity boasting of her sinful life and declaring that she would live it over again in the same way if she had the opportunity, and then handing over the partner of her guilt to the virtuous young lady who moves in the most fashionable society, who accepts him without the slightest hesitation, and assures the dying wretch that she does not blame her for the life she has led. That is the crown of Mr. Crawford's latest work.

SOCIALISM: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application. By *Victor Cathrein, S. J.* Authorized translation of the eighth German edition, with special reference to the condition of Socialism in the United States. Revised and enlarged by Victor F. Gettelmann, S. J. 12mo., pp. 424. New York: Benziger Brothers.

There can be no question as to the timeliness of the appearance of this book. The evil which it strives to combat is world-wide, ruinous and spreading. Until comparatively recent years we were free from it in this country; but the large immigration of the heterogeneous masses from Europe, with their grievances, real and imaginary, and their revolutionary, socialistic, anarchistic and atheistic tendencies, begotten by the peculiar conditions in which they were born and lived, has brought the evil to our very doors and into our houses. The effect is seen even in the youngest, smallest and least important servant. Speaking of the growth of the evil, the author says:

"Within the last few years socialism has spread to an alarming extent. At the last general election in Germany, June 16, 1903, it polled considerably above three million votes. The jubilant exultation of socialists at this unparalleled success may easily be imagined. 'Berlin, the capital of socialism! Germany, the realm of social democracy!' Thus the Vorwarts triumphantly exclaimed.

"In view of this gigantic development of social democracy it certainly behooves every man of culture, but above all the leaders in civil and social life, to become familiar with socialist ideas, to

make themselves acquainted with the scientific basis so much vaunted by socialists, and to form an independent judgment concerning them."

For a time it was thought that the evil could be best met by force, and indeed even at the present time many who are in power are trying to stay it in that way. The writer does not agree with them. He says:

"To oppose the spread of socialism by means of police regulations, as was done by the famous Socialist Law of Germany, must always prove utterly abortive; in this struggle intellectual and moral weapons rather will be used to advantage."

Some writers think that social reform is all that is required, and many professed socialists claim that this is all they desire. It is true that social reform along reasonable lines will remove the grievances which now furnish ample material for the declamation of social agitators. "But social reform is not the real aim of socialists. Their purpose is the radical subversion of all existing social conditions and the reconstruction of society on an entirely new basis. That this their attempt is impracticable and fraught with disaster is to be seen in these pages. This theoretical exposition of socialism has become more important nowadays than ever before; nay, it is absolutely necessary.

"From these remarks it is clear that our object is purely critical and negative. We do not make any proposals of practical reforms, not because we are opposed to them or deem them superfluous, but because they are beyond the scope of this work.

"In our refutation of socialists it has been our constant endeavor to enter into their ideas to the best of our power, to study their principles in their own writings, to inquire into the foundations upon which their system is based, to examine their principal demands and the relations they bear to each other.

Since its first appearance in 1890 Father Cathrein's book has gone through eight large editions. It has been translated into Spanish, French, English, Italian, Polish, Flemish, Bohemian and Hungarian. Competent critics have declared the present volume to be the best refutation of socialism to be found in the German language. The generous praise bestowed from such different quarters gives proof that Father Cathrein's accuracy and thoroughness may be relied upon and renders any commendation on our part superfluous. However, a few words of explanation as to the making of the present edition may not be out of place. In view of the quickened activity and growing influence of socialists in the United States it became highly desirable to have an English version of this book in accordance with the latest German edition. Besides comprising all the

matter contained in the eighth German edition, the present volume offers a reliable account of socialism in the United States compiled from authentic socialist sources. Also in other respects the book has been adapted throughout in American conditions. It has thus been increased to more than twice the size of the former American editions, and may rightly be styled a new work. A copious alphabetical index will no doubt enhance the practical value of the work. Here is the author's conclusion, drawn from sound premises:

"We trust the unprejudiced reader who has patiently followed us throughout our exposition has gained the conviction that socialism, even in its most rational and scientific form, is visionary and impracticable. It is based on untenable religious, philosophical and economic principles, and, far from leading to the glorious results held out by its advocates to the unlearned masses, would prove disastrous to that culture which Christianity has produced, and would reduce human society to a state of utter barbarism."

The book is fittingly closed with the great encyclicals of Leo XIII. on "The Condition of Labor" and on "Christian Democracy."

THE MIDDLE AGES. Sketches and Fragments. By *Thomas J. Shahan*, S. T. D., J. U. L., Professor of Church History in the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; author of "The Beginnings of Christianity," etc. 8vo., pp. 432. New York: Benziger Brothers.

When we expressed the hope in our review of Dr. Shahan's charming essays on "The Beginnings of Christianity" that the learned author would be able to continue their publication, we hardly expected that our hope would be realized so soon. But here is the second volume, bringing the studies into the Middle Ages, and we are sure that it will be as warmly welcomed as was its predecessor. The prompt appearance of the second volume encourages us to think that the first was appreciated. We do not mean by scholars only, who know so well the value of a work of this kind, but by the general serious minded reading public, irrespective of creed, who want to know the truth in history. Indeed, Dr. Shahan's essays should appeal to even a wider circle of readers, for they are as interesting as the best novels.

The period covered by the new volume is fully as attractive for the writer and student as the earlier period, and although the writer must necessarily limit himself in so wide a field, yet the selections are so well made as to create definite impressions in regard to the period as a whole. The author states his purpose in the following words:

"The historical sketches and fragments that are here submitted

to the general reader deal only with a few phases of the rich and varied life of the period known as the Middle Ages. The writer will be amply rewarded if they serve to arouse a wider interest in that thousand years of Christian history that opens with Clovis and closes with the discovery of the New World. Both in Church and State the life of to-day is rooted in those ten marvelous centuries of transition, during which the Catholic Church was mother and nurse to the infant nations of the West, a prop and consolation to the Christians of the Orient. Our modern institutions and habits of thought, our ideals and the great lines of our history are not intelligible apart from a sufficient understanding of what men thought, hoped, attempted, suffered and founded in the days when there was but one Christian faith from Otranto to Drontheim. The problems that now agitate us and seem to threaten our inherited social order were problems for the mediæval man. The conflicts and difficulties that make up the sum of political history for the last four centuries are only the last chapters of a story of surpassing interest that opens with the formal establishment of Christian thought as the basis and norm of social existence and development."

The titles of the essays are: "Gregory the Great and the Barbarian World," "Justinian the Great," "The Religion of Islam," "Catholicism in the Middle Ages," "The Christians of St. Thomas," "The Mediæval Teacher," "The Book of a Mediæval Mother," "German Schools in the Sixteenth Century," "Baths and Bathing in the Middle Ages," "Clergy and People in Mediæval England," "The Cathedral Builders of Mediæval Europe," "The Results of the Crusades on the Italian Renaissance."

They have appeared elsewhere at intervals, principally in THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, the *Catholic University Bulletin*, the *Catholic World*, the *Ave Maria* and the *Catholic Times*.

We trust that the very reverend author will be able to follow this volume with a third in the near future, and we are glad to be one of the original channels through which such valuable information reaches the public.

JOSEPH KARDINAL HERGENROETHER'S HANDBUCH DER ALLEGEMEINEN KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. Vierte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Zweiter Band: Die Kirche als Leiterin der abendlaendischen Gesellschaft. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$5.00 net.

With remarkable promptness the second volume of Professor Kirsch's revision of Cardinal Hergenroether's Manual of Church History follows upon the first, already commended in this REVIEW about a year ago. A year's use of the former volume has caused

us to modify our objection to the freedom which the editor allowed himself to take with the text. We believe that the changes are all of a nature to improve the great work in every respect, and that Hergenroether would be the first to ratify them. Not only has Dr. Kirsch brought the work up to date by availing himself of the results of historical investigations during the past twenty years, but also his distribution of the vast material is more scientific and gives the reader a clearer survey of the progress of events. We are still of opinion that it would have been a decided improvement if the history could have been issued in a half dozen easily handled volumes instead of three bulky ones, the first of 722 and the second of 1,104 pages. This, however, was impossible so long as the History remained a portion of the great "Theologische Bibliothek."

The volume before us conducts the history of the Church from the days of the first political union with the new nations of the East in the times of the early Carolingians to the eve of the Protestant Reformation, that is, the whole period of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. To condense a stretch of eight centuries into a compass of a single volume is no easy task; in fact, it is much more difficult to write satisfactorily a succinct narrative than an extended one. That Cardinal Hergenroether's Manual was by far the most perfect history of its kind that had yet been produced was the unanimous verdict of Catholic scholars; and this favorable opinion is now confirmed by no less an authority than the Supreme Pontiff, who in a letter addressed to the publisher of an Italian version of Kirsch's first volume and placed at the head of the second volume, bestows unstinted praise as well upon the eminent writer as upon his present editor, and recommends the book warmly to the Italian clergy. Would that so valuable a work were made equally accessible to English-speaking peoples! We have absolutely nothing like it in our language.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS, ad Mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernibus Moribus accommodata. Tomus Tertius: De Virtute Institiae et De Variis Statuum obligationibus. Auctore ad. Tanqueray, S. S. 8vo., pp. xx.+547+31*. Neo Aboraci: Benziger Fratres.

We reviewed the first volume of Father Tanqueray's work on "Moral Theology" with pleasure some time ago. It was so excellent in every respect as to create in us a desire to see the work completed. The examination of the third volume increases this desire, and we are glad to note that the second volume is promised within a year.

We might sum up our criticism of this book by saying that the author lives up to his title, and although this might seem small

praise at first sight, on further consideration it will be found to be high commendation.

We have here a synopsis of moral and pastoral theology in three moderate sized volumes. It is not hard to make a synopsis of any subject or work which will touch every part, but it is very hard to make one that will give to each part the amount of attention which it requires so as to preserve that nice balance which brings about comprehensiveness with clearness and conciseness. Father Tanquerey has that happy faculty. To acquire it one must know his subject well, and he must be well acquainted with his clients. He must also take into consideration the changes that come with the advancement of time, and the variations of conditions in different countries and amid new environments. Then he must have the courage to recognize these variations and changes and fit his subject to them. Father Tanquerey has done this in his "Moral Theology." As he is writing it for America, he takes account of all the conditions peculiar to this country and regulates his subject matter accordingly. This does not require that any violence shall be done to the moral law. On the contrary, it supposes a surer groundwork so that the adjustment to special conditions may be more safely made.

An illustration of this adjustment is found in the present volume in the section on Socialism, which is so closely connected with the question of justice at the present time as to demand very special attention. The author recognizes this and treats the question accordingly. This is only one illustration of the practical value of the book. Throughout the whole work Father Tanquerey shows his knowledge of the practical needs of the moral theologian on the mission in this country and his ability to supply them.

A special feature of the present volume is a concise summary of the civil law of Great Britain and the United States, on copyright, patents, real and personal property, parent and child, guardian and ward, husband and wife, corporations, prescription, contracts, last will and testament and the law of descent.

We feel sure that it will be universally conceded that this book is a very valuable addition to the excellent manuals of moral theology which have already appeared in this country, and that it occupies a distinctive place.

SUMMA THEOLOGIAE MORALIS SCHOLARUM USUI ACCOMMODAVIT. *H. Noldin*,
S. J., S. Theologiae Professor in Universitate Oenipotana. 3 volumena,
8vo. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

This is the fourth edition of Father Noldin's work on Moral Theology, and no book on the subject in recent years has won higher

encomiums on the other side. Even a cursory glance at the work convinces one that these encomiums are well merited. The author follows the usual order and covers the whole field, and in this he is not remarkable, but in the discernment which he shows in giving due prominence to the most important feature of each question, while arranging subsidiary matter in such a manner as to show its lesser degree of importance, he shows the master who is most helpful to the student. We have said that he follows the usual order in arrangement, but he has made two exceptions to this rule. After the treatise "*De principiis*" in the first volume he adds distinct fasciendae "*De Sexto Praecepto et De Usu Matrimonii*" and "*De Poenis Ecclesiasticis*."

We have never read a clearer author. We may say without reservation that Father Noldin knows his subject, which is not surprising in a teacher of moral theology; but we may add that he is able to make others know it, and this is surprising indeed. The most learned men are often the most obscure. This is not more evident in any field than in the field of moral theology. How often have we not all gone to some standard author to seek light and found only darkness. No one who consults Noldin can make this complaint. We have never met a clearer author. His one great desire is to communicate thought, and he chooses the simplest language to do it. Any student of Latin can follow him. If Latin authors would follow his example in this respect there would be no demand for text-books of theology in the vernacular.

This book is sure to win favor in the United States as it has won it in Europe, although it makes no pretense of being adapted to this country. We should not be surprised, however, to see a later edition with such adaptation.

THE PULPIT ORATOR. Containing seven elaborate skeleton sermons, or homiletic, dogmatical, liturgical, symbolical and moral sketches, for every Sunday of the year. Also elaborate skeleton sermons for the chief festivals and other occasions. By *Rev. John Evangelist Bollner*. Translated from the German with permission of the author, and adapted by the Rev. Augustine Wirth, O. S. B., with preface by the Rev. A. A. Lambing. Tenth revised edition. Six Vols. Large 8vo., about 450 pp. each. New York: Pustet & Co.

The tenth edition of so pretentious a book as "*The Pulpit Orator*" is its best recommendation. Nothing but merit could create a demand for so many editions of a sermon book in six volumes at the present time, when the market is flooded with sermon books of all shapes and sizes. The first edition of this book was a thousand copies. We do not know the size of succeeding editions, but we have in mind other similar works in several volumes

that have appeared and disappeared in recent years without any demand for even a second edition.

We seldom commend sermon books; on the contrary, we generally condemn them for several reasons. The work before us is an exception. In it the author never preaches himself, never runs after novelties, never strains for effect, but he develops in a straightforward, simple manner the epistle and gospel of the day. Hence the work is somewhat in the nature of a commentary, and that is the very best sermon book.

Here the preacher is furnished with abundance as well as variety. For each Sunday he has homiletic, dogmatical, liturgical, symbolical and moral sketches. It is a well-known fact that preachers have moods as well as hearers, and hence the wisdom of such a storehouse. But we feel that "The Pulpit Orator" does not need further commendation. Its merits are too well known to all except perhaps the very recently ordained, to whom it will prove a welcome friend.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN SOCIAL LIFE. By *Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.* 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is an unusually strong collection of essays on vital questions connected with the social life. The reverend author is a clear, strong thinker, who puts his thoughts into plain, vigorous language, so that they have a convincing force not always found in works of this kind. Some of the essays have been used originally as addresses, and some of them have been published before singly, but they appear together now for the first time. The author says of them:

"Several of the papers in this volume—"St. Francis and You," "The Workingman's Apostolate," "The Priest and Social Reform" and "The Idea of Responsibility"—have already appeared as pamphlets or as articles in magazines. I have to thank the editors of the *Catholic World*, the *Tablet* and the *Weekly Register* for their kind permission to reprint these articles.

"Throughout these papers the reader will perceive a unity of thought and purpose. My desire has been to give expression to the Catholic mind touching some of the most urgent questions of the hour in regard to social life and conduct. I have written not for the student or specialist, but for the ordinary intelligent wayfarer whom these questions concern."

As speakers and writers frequently want short treatises on such subjects, and as these are so excellent, we think it well to add the entire table of contents:

Part I.—"The Church and Personal Liberty," "The Christian

State," "The Education of Women," "Marriage," "The Value of Work," "The Priest and Social Reform," "The Responsibility of Wealth," "The Idea of Responsibility."

Part II.—"Religious Aspects of Social Work," "The Workingman's Apostolate:" 1. "The Catholic Workingman a Missioner," 2. "Conditions Essential to Workingman's Apostolate," 3. "Duties of the Catholic Workingman at the Present Time." "St. Francis and You:" 1. "The Franciscan Vocation," 3. "The Three Radical Evils in Society at the Present Day," 3. "The Need of Personal Service."

LIFE OF ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY, DUCHESS OF THURINGIA. By the *Count de Montalembert*, Peer of France, Member of the French Academy. Translated by Francis Deming Hoyt. 8vo., pp. 491. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Montalembert's "Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary" has been a classic so long that it seems superfluous to praise—for one cannot speak of it without praising it—and yet it may not be known to the present generation as well as it deserves. It is possible, too, that it has been somewhat overshadowed by the distinguished author's larger and more frequently quoted work, "The Monks of the West." For many readers the following words quoted from the preface may be a surprise:

"Of his literary works the best known and most valuable is undoubtedly 'The Monks of the West.' But it is to the inspiration from which he drew his work upon 'The Life of St. Elizabeth' that we owe the later and larger work. The first was the sweet and fragrant flower that yielded in due time its rich and abundant fruit.

"And here we recall that in opening and closing the beautiful 'Life of St. Elizabeth' Montalembert quotes the words of our Blessed Lord: 'Jesus answered and said: I confess to Thee of Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to little ones.'"

Those who have not made the acquaintance of this splendid example cannot do so under more favorable conditions than in this edition, while old friends will rejoice to see their favorite so becomingly clad.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and Their Peoples, Their History and Records of Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the close of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the originals. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

An important announcement is made by the Arthur H. Clark

Company in connection with their monumental and exhaustive work on the history of the Philippine Islands, which is in course of publication. It is worthy of note that the publishers are showing that they feel the importance of the work which they have undertaken by improving wherever possible. The latest announcement follows:

"A chronological list of all the Spanish Governors of the Philippine Islands, from 1565 to 1899, furnishing in condensed form valuable information regarding each—the date and place of his birth, dignities held, arrival in the islands, term of office, important events therein, date of death, etc.—will appear in Volume XVII. of 'The Philippine Islands: 1493-1898' (A. H. Clark Company, Cleveland). No such list has yet appeared in any other publication, although in some Spanish works there are biographical notices of the successive Governors up to the middle of the nineteenth century. The list above referred to will be of the utmost value alike to students and to general readers of Philippine history. It may be added that all students of modern European history will be greatly aided by similar chronological tables found in Volume I. of the same series—lists of the Roman Pontiffs, the rulers of Spain and the rulers of Portugal, from 1493 to 1803. These lists also cannot be found in any other work, and all have been carefully prepared from many sources—sifting, collating and verifying data which are scattered and sometimes conflicting."

SEQUENTIA CHRISTIANA, OR ELEMENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By Charles B. Dawson, S. J., B. A., Exeter College, Oxford. 12mo., pp. xvi.+316. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The object of this little work is to give a simple and concise account of the chief doctrines of the Catholic religion in their natural and logical sequence. It is intended for the use of those who, like the author, have the happiness of being brought, by the special mercy of God, from the misery and danger of doubt to the fullness and Divine certainty of faith. It may also serve as a beacon-light to souls—and there are many—who are struggling up steep and difficult paths to the rock of safety and strength—the Ancient City of Refuge—the Catholic Church. Those also who are engaged in the charitable work of instructing converts and others into justice may find it a book on which to base their teaching. The writer does not attempt to prove what is stated by long arguments; he relies chiefly upon the more reasonable force of the bare statement of truth itself and upon the authority before which most of those for whom he is writing bow—the Holy Scriptures."

This is an exceptionally good book of its kind. It is comprehensive, the catechism furnishing the ground plan. The order is faithfully followed, and hence the logical sequence is preserved; the language is simple, clear and dignified; the quotations are apt and satisfying and the references full. The marginal index is an excellent feature of the book, and on the whole we should say that there is nothing better published in this field.

There is an air of repose about the book, if the term may be used in this connection, that is seldom found. The author has evidently worked slowly and carefully, and the result is a book unexcelled and well worthy of the attention of those interested.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Dealing with its language, literature and contents, including Biblical theology. Edited by *James Hastings, M. A., D. D.* Vol. V., royal 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The appearance of this volume may surprise those who have not followed closely the work as it came from the press. It was announced in the beginning that the work was to be in four volumes, and the editors and publishers did not break faith with the public, for the dictionary proper was completed within the prescribed limits. The additional volume is really supplementary and should be procured by those who subscribed for the original work.

During the progress of the dictionary through the press it was seen that here and there its articles touched somewhat closely upon subjects that lay outside the precise scope of a dictionary of the Bible, but articles on these subjects are not only interesting in themselves, but are most helpful to the study of the Bible, and indeed necessary if that study is to be thorough and abreast of modern scholarship. It was therefore decided that an extra volume should be prepared to include such articles as well as a series of indexes which had been no part of the original plan, but of which many readers of the dictionary had urged the utility.

The volume will not be sold separate, but will be supplied only to subscribers for the original work. It is, we consider, fully as valuable as any of the other volumes.

MORAL BRIEFS. A concise, reasoned and popular exposition of Catholic morals. By *Rev. John H. Stapleton.* 12mo., pp. 311. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The contents of this volume appeared originally in the *Catholic Transcript*, of Hartford, Conn., in weekly instalments, from Feb-

ruary, 1901, to February, 1903. During the course of their publication it became evident that the form of instruction adopted was appreciated by a large number of readers in varied conditions of life—this appreciation being evinced, among other ways, by a frequent and widespread demand for back numbers of the published journal. The management, finding itself unable to meet this demand, suggested the bringing out of the entire series in book form; and thus, with very few corrections, we offer the 'Briefs' to all desirous of a better acquaintance with Catholic morals."

So much for the history of the book. As for the substance, it is made up of a series of short instructions on the capital sins, the Divine virtues and the commandments of God. They are written in popular form, without quotations from the Sacred Scriptures or the Fathers, and hence have not that solid value which is demanded in subjects of this kind. But perhaps this was foreign to the author's purpose, who was writing primarily for the reader of a newspaper, who is not generally inclined to devote serious thought to his occupation, and therefore requires special treatment.

IN MANY LANDS. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. Author of "Leaves From the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy," "Life of Catherine McAuley," etc. 12mo., pp. xx+460. New York: O'Shea & Co.

The author, who is well known through the other books which she has written, tells of a visit which she and her companions made to Europe. The narrative is bright, interesting and instructive. There is nothing new in books of this kind except the new point of view, but very much depends on that. If one cannot visit foreign lands and see them through his own eyes, the next best thing is to see them through the eyes of some one who can reproduce the pictures in words. Now as in painting one will admire the picture of one artist and another prefer a picture of the same subject by a different, so in books. Competent judges who heard this book read in manuscript urged its publication in order that a larger number might enjoy the pleasure which had been limited to a few.

DIE PARABELN DES HERRN IM EVANGELIU exegetisch und praktisch erlaeutert: Von *Leopold Fonck, S. J.* Second edition, enlarged and improved. Innsbruck: Pustet. 900 pages.

Upon the foundation of a thoroughly scientific exegesis, the learned Professor Fonck, S. J., of the University of Innsbruck, has built up a work of surpassing spiritual beauty. That the book filled a much-felt need was shown by the rapidity with which the

first edition disappeared from the market. In fact, it is difficult to explain why so fascinating a subject as Our Lord's Parables should have been for long so comparatively neglected in Catholic circles, even in Germany. This is the more remarkable, since the Protestant and Rationalistic world have been abundantly supplied with literature on the subject. Father Fonck came to his task excellently equipped. A lengthy sojourn in the Holy Land made him familiar with the physical background upon which, as he beautifully phrases it, "the Lord traced in magnificent coloring His wonderful imagery." No detail of Palestinian life and conditions escaped his watchful eye, and he was thus enabled to bring forth out of a well replenished treasury new things and old. The use of the book for the purpose of preaching is greatly facilitated by the copious indexes at the end, especially by the reference to the gospels of the year. As usual, we close with the regret that we have nothing so perfect in our language.

JESUS CHRIST THE WORD INCARNATE. Considerations gathered from the Works of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas. By *Roger Freddi, S. J.* Translated from the Italian by F. J. Sullivan, S. J. St. Louis: Herder. Price, net, \$1.25.

That no one since the days of the inspired Apostles has written of the divine personality of Our Lord with the power and dignity of the incomparable Doctor Angelicus is the definite judgment of the Catholic Church, a judgment ratified by the Word Incarnate in the immortal words: "*Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma.*" It was a gracious thought, therefore, of Father Freddi, after himself thoroughly digesting the Summa and other writings of the saint, to give the substance of them, as far as they related to Our Lord, in a simple form adapted to every intelligence. The author has carefully avoided admitting a single idea which he did not find in his master; so that we may say that he speaks to us precisely as St. Thomas would do were he addressing a modern miscellaneous audience on the subject so near his heart. We commend the book with all earnestness, not only to seminarians and preachers, but also to religious communities and, in fact, to all educated Catholics.

VERA SAPIENTIA, OR TRUE WISDOM. Translated from the Latin of *Thomas à Kempis* by the Right Rev. Mgr. Byrne, D. D., V. G. (Adelaide, South Australia). 12mo., pp. x.+204. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We quote from the preface by the author:

"The works of Thomas à Kempis need no praise, for they have stood the test of time, which commits to oblivion many works that

had been once praised and wide read. I have never seen an English translation of the work of Thomas à Kempis entitled 'Vera Sapientia' ('True Wisdom'). A Latin copy of this work published in Paris in 1804 came into my hands. Having read it with pleasure and profit, I did it into English. Friends to whom I showed it advised me to publish it, in the belief and hope that it would do good."

We are quite sure that all readers of this little book will be glad that the translator yielded to the persuasion of the friends who advised its publication. It is filled with the unction and sweetness with which we are familiar in the eternal Imitation. It is divided into books as that work is, treating of "That virtue has to carry on war with vice," "What things can be truly and justly called bad," "The miseries which the good endure in this world" and "On the virtues of a truly Christian man."

ROSA MYSTICA: The Fifteen Mysteries of the Most Holy Rosary and Other Joys, Sorrows and Glories of Mary. By *Kenelm Digby Best*, of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. St. Louis: Herder. Price, net, \$6.00.

This magnificent volume is a tribute to Mary Immaculate on occasion of the jubilee of her Immaculate Conception. No expense has been spared to make it in every way worthy of its object. The copious illustrations, selected from the works of all the great Catholic artists, are beyond all praise, and the accompanying text of Father Best is replete with sound doctrine, pervaded with a spirit of filial devotion to the Queen of the Holy Rosary entirely worthy of a child of St. Philip. We are sorry that the book arrived in our hands too late for the glorious jubilee itself; but it has enduring worth, and must find its way into universal favor.

THE GOSPEL APPLIED TO OUR TIMES. A sermon for every Sunday in the year. By *Rev. D. S. Phelan*. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1904. Price, \$2.00 net.

Father Phelan has so original and trenchant a mode of expressing his thoughts that we fancy we should have detected the authorship of these fine sermons, even had they been issued anonymously. Each one has all the snap and verve of an editorial in the *Western Watchman*, tempered, however, by that keen sense of responsibility which every good priest feels who is delivering, not his private views, but a divine message. Long known as the most fearless and efficient of our Catholic editors, Father Phelan may now add to his titles that of "powerfullest preacher." There is a directness,

a conciseness and a freshness about these sermons that will secure them an enduring place in the esteem of the American clergy. We have no doubt the veteran editor has many other arrows in his quiver. We trust he will shoot them at us.

PROGRESS IN PRAYER. Translated from the Instructions Spirituelles of *R. P. Caussade, S. J.*, by *L. V. Sheehan*. Adapted and edited, with an introduction, by *Joseph McSorley, C. S. P.* St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1904. Price, 75 cents.

The editor's introduction to this excellent manual of instruction in spiritual science contains a brief account of the errors of Quietism and Bossuet's unfortunate controversy with Fenelon. By the practical form of question and answer many points are very clearly stated in a way especially adapted to the needs of beginners. In the attempt to tread the mystical way of perfection there should be guidance by one who has "the sure eye and steady foot of the Alpine climber." For the encouragement and direction of souls aspiring to close union with God this volume of 178 pages will be found one of the best now available in the English language.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PRAYER BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS. A complete manual of prayers and devotions for the use of the members of all religious communities. A practical guide to the particular examen and to the methods of meditation. By *Rev. F. X. Lasance*. 12mo., pp. 1,153. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By *Rev. F. Arndt, S. J.* Translated from the Latin by *I. M. Fastre*. 16mo., pp. 734. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE MIRROR OF TRUE MANHOOD AS REFLECTED IN THE LIFE OF ST. JOSEPH. From the French. By *Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D.* 16mo., pp. 325. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

COR CORDIUM. THOUGHTS FOR THE CLIENTS OF THE SACRED HEART. Written and compiled by *Madame Cecelia*, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham. 24mo., pp. 133. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE ROSARY: SCENES AND THOUGHTS. By *Rev. F. P. Garesche, S. J.* 32mo., pp. 177. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE NEW CENTURY CATHOLIC SERIES OF READERS. Third and fourth. Illustrated with black and white pictures, and with chromo-lithographs. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE MAIORIS, a Dominica in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in albis, iuxta Ordinem Brevionii, Missalis et Pontificalis Romani editum. 12mo., pp. 420. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

A LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE. By *William J. Rolfe, Litt. D.* One volume, cloth, 8vo., illustrated, \$3.00. Same, one-half morocco, \$5.00. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

